

THE  
PROSPECTIVE REVIEW.

---

No. VI.

---

ART. I.—MOHAMMED THE PROPHET.

*Mohammed der Prophet, sein Leben und seine Lehre.* (The Life and Doctrine of Mohammed the Prophet, drawn from Manuscript sources and the Koran.) By Dr. Gustav Weil. Stuttgart: 1843.

WHATEVER comparative rank Islam may claim among the religions of the world, either as to the purity of its doctrine, or as to the number of its adherents, there is no doubt that it surpasses them all in the degree of information which it furnishes as to the person and circumstances of its founder. For whereas, in the case of some founders of new religions, their very name and historical place are either altogether lost, or are but obscurely certain; and, in that of others, there exists no clearer record of their individuality than what is indelibly stamped on the character of the doctrines they promulgated, or is deduced from the scattered events of their public life,—the personal history of Mohammed—especially from the date of his mission—has been preserved to us with a fulness and order of incident, and with a minuteness of detail, of which there are but few examples, in any department of biography, before the invention of the art of printing.

There are three sources from which this fuller knowledge of the Arabian Prophet is derived: the Koran, the Traditions, and the native biographies. The Koran, as the collection of his accredited prophetic enunciations, is an

CHRISTIAN TEACHER.—No. 32.

M

authentic representation of the light in which he viewed his high function, or, at least, of that in which he wished it to appear; and, as it was delivered to his followers by piecemeal, during a period of twenty-three years, and as it is full of references to the emergencies of the time and place under which each portion was promulgated, it bears numerous incidental traces of the circumstances of his life, and of his sentiments in different junctures. But, as it is precisely these perpetual allusions to the events of his time and office which constitute the main obscurities of the Koran, we should not be able, at this distance of time, to read it with anything like a proper appreciation of the occasions and objects of a large portion of its contents, were it not for the extraordinary light which the Traditions afford for its interpretation. These Traditions so far exceed the expectations which any one would—on a cursory estimate of the circumstances entitling him to look for such minute records of a person who lived in Arabia more than twelve hundred years ago—be likely to entertain, that it is a satisfaction to know that peculiar causes conspired to ensure their abundance and general accuracy. Of these causes the following are the principal: The division of the Arabs into tribes, each of which had some ancestral pride in the warriors and poets which it had produced, had, in the utter absence of surnames, fostered a tendency to genealogical record. The art of writing was then so recent and so very rare an acquisition, that it had not—as it manifestly does in the more advanced stages of its use—at all impaired that extraordinary tenacity of memory to which the Arabs had been obliged to trust as to the only archive of their history. The degree of culture, too, to which their language had attained through the generally-diffused appreciation of, and skill in, poetry and eloquence, had so far outrun their possession of the mechanical aids for preserving such memorials, that the faculty of verbal memory also had received an unusual development. And, lastly, the prophetic mission of Mohammed was so eminently the great event in their national life, and was full of so manifold a significance to the receivers of his doctrine, that it supplied all who had access to his person with every motive which either political or religious interests could inspire, to treasure up the most trifling record of his words and actions. These Traditions,

then, of which upwards of seven thousand have been transmitted to our times, have long been systematically employed by native theologians and jurists in tracing out the origin of all the obscure allusions in the Koran; and the interpretation of their sacred book has thus become a parallel commentary on the life of its author. The native biographers, finally—or rather, as we must include those who have written in the Persian and Turkish languages also, the Muslim biographers—which are to be counted by hundreds, and of which about fifty lay claim to be considered as authoritative sources, have formed their narratives on the basis of these Traditions; and have attempted, with very various, but generally very humble, degrees of critical acumen, to reconcile their discrepancies, and to elicit historical truth out of the conflict of testimonies.

Although there are such abundant sources from which the materials for a biography of the Arabian Prophet may be derived, we are, nevertheless, very far from wishing to represent it as an easy task to make a judicious use of them. For—not to mention that but a portion of the most reputed native authorities is readily accessible to European scholars—the testimony of none of the documents to which we have access, is entitled to claim implicit credence. Even the Koran itself must be used with discretion; for, over and above the facts that it is his own testimony in his own cause, and that it possesses no chronological arrangement of its parts, it is open to the further objection that some passages, once there, have been lost or suppressed, and that others have been interpolated. But, whatever deductions we may therefore be called on to allow from the absolute authenticity of the Koran, they can be but trifling, when compared with those which a sound criticism is obliged to make from the authority of the Traditions. They undoubtedly contain a surprising mass of genuine anecdote, and preserve several most characteristic traits of the Prophet's inner and outer life; but they are often but witnesses from whom the truth is to be extorted, or whose testimony is to be summarily rejected. For it is not only that they possess very various grades of extrinsic sanction, as depending on the persons from whom they have been derived; nor that they are sometimes mutually contradictory, or are inconsistent with facts otherwise established; nor that pious fraud

and selfish interests may have contrived some actual forgeries,—but that they also contain many superstitious legends, and envelop the Prophet in such a halo of miraculous qualities as both to seriously impair the dignity of his true history, and to discredit the whole body of Traditions. To give only one specimen of the really disparaging effect of these legends: It would surely be a strong recommendation of Mohammed's claims as a divine messenger, if it could be made to appear that he had pursued a noiseless but blameless tenor of life until his fortieth year; that his humble aspirations after a clearer sense of the God whom his people worshipped ignorantly and under so many forms, had gradually raised him to a fitness to receive the conviction of so great a truth; and that it was long before he ventured on more than a hesitating and tentative declaration of his new convictions; and, in fact, many evidences, and all internal probabilities, favour the belief that his early progress was by such modest stages. But the authors of the Traditions have so little sense of this, that they put the following legend into the mouth of Amina, his mother, who, it is to be observed, died in the sixth year after his birth: "When my travail drew near, Asia the consort of Pharaoh, and Mariam the sister of Moses, together with some Huris, visited me, and offered me a draught, which was sweeter than honey. Immediately God opened my eyes, and I saw three standards erected, one in the remotest east, the other in the west, and the third on the Kaaba. But, as soon as Mohammed was born, a light spread itself over the whole earth, so that I saw the castles of Damascus by the brightness of it; then a white cloud descended and enveloped Mohammed, and a voice cried, Go through the universe with Mohammed, and present him to all angels, genii, men, and animals; give him Adam's form, Seth's science, Noah's courage, Abraham's love (that of God to him), Ishmael's tongue, Isaac's favour, Lot's wisdom, Jacob's joy (at finding Joseph), Moses's strength, Job's patience, the resignation of Jonah, the strategic skill of Joshua, the voice of David, the love of Daniel (to God), the firmness of John, and the continence of Jesus.—The cloud then retired, and I saw three men, one of whom held a silver ewer, the other an emerald basin, and the third a white silk cloth, in which a seal was wrapped



up. They washed him seven times; then they impressed the seal of prophecy on his back, and wrapped him in the cloth which they had brought with them." These fables may be only a natural fruit of that aberration of the religious feeling which results from man's interposing himself, as a channel of communication, between God and man; or, they may be considered to be the effect of a contagious emulation of the creed of the only Christians with whom the Muslim came into contact, who had, as indeed the church of that age had, equally edifying legends of their saints and martyrs. In the latter case, the corrupt Christianity which Islam had abashed and paralysed, must, nevertheless, have been able to alloy the triumphant monotheism with an element of hagiolatry; just in the same way as Roman paganism had, in its fall, been able to bequeath to victorious Christianity—like Nessus to the hero who slew him—the taint of its expiring idolatries.

Before these difficulties, however, can be entirely overcome—before conflicting testimonies can be harmonised, and authorities confronted and balanced—there is still an important preliminary question to be settled, and one which may exercise a material influence on even critical decisions. From what subjective point of view will the historian regard Mohammed's pretensions to the character of a divine messenger? For, the points of view on which he may place himself are so different, and their range of vision so various, that some of them may exclude all the evil, as completely as others do all the good, elements of his character. The former have been almost exclusively appropriated to his followers (le Conte de Boulainvilliers being the chief exception of any mark); while, among Europeans, he has generally fallen into the hands of some *advocatus diaboli*, who thought he did religion a service by submitting the Arabian prophet to every disparagement of a distorted perspective. The fact that his claims and doctrines profess to abut so closely on the Jewish and Christian revelations—instead of forming an additional ground for a lenient estimate of all palliating circumstances in him, and for a candid appreciation of all semblances of conformity in his doctrine—has exposed them to a more illiberal construction; and has procured him the honour of such malignity of censure as the history of controversy

shows to be reserved for those who have common points of agreement. The same persons, perhaps, who might have been able to form a reasonable and tolerant view of Zoroaster or Buddha, have no mercy for one who declared that he came not to destroy the law or the gospel, but to reclaim both to their monotheistic foundations. The tendency to this latter extreme, however, seems now, happily, to belong to the past. Modern times have made measured approaches to new points of view, which do and will lead to a revision of some of the recorded judgments; and though no one, perhaps, has yet arisen to reinstate Mohammed in the full possession of the place due to him—at least, no one who has taken advantage, both of all the flaws in the writ of ejection, and of all the arguments to be adduced in support of his claims—still enough has been already done in this direction to entitle us to exclaim, in the words of the Koran, “Is not the morning near?”

The biography of Mohammed, by Dr. Weil, is itself a favourable indication of the approach of this more candid spirit. His scholarlike acquaintance with Arabic—towards which a five years' residence in the East supplied the means of familiarity, while Germany added those of philological accuracy—has enabled him to weigh evidences for himself, and to appreciate more distinctly the native aspect of all that depends on the language for its true colours. His fortunate access to some manuscript authorities of the highest repute, and his constant adherence to them, confer on his biography the dignity of an independent foundation; he has likewise availed himself, with judgment, of the chief printed works which bear even collaterally on his subject. From these resources he has composed an orderly narrative of the prophet's life; in which he has reserved the text for the results of his researches after probable truth, and has assigned to the legends, the substance of discordant testimonies, and the notice of former mis-statements, a separate place in his copious notes. Fullness and accuracy of detail, zeal for the establishment of facts rather than of theories, and the regular citation of his vouchers, constitute the most praiseworthy characteristics of his work. But he also discusses the arguments of opposite views with much acumen, and seems free from any partialities unworthy of an historian.

Although, in a work which so far surpasses its predecessors in accuracy and comprehensiveness, several old errors must needs be exploded, and several new facts discovered, yet the reader must not be surprised to learn that no fresh circumstances are brought to light which are weighty enough to form the cardinal points of a new estimate of Mohammed's character and position. The main outline of his life are to be found in several accessible books; and, if they could only be disentangled from the web of insinuation and artful construction with which they are often interwoven, would present an adequate basis for a reasonable judgment on him. Not, indeed, that every additional fact, anecdote, and trait, is not necessarily an item to swell the sum of impressions for or against him, or does not help to complete the moral portraiture; but that, after a certain stage, the accessions of incident do but increase the mass, without very materially altering the quality, of the evidence. For these reasons, we forbear to enter into any detailed examination of Dr. Weil's work as a biography, and content ourselves with the notice of a few detached particulars.

Among the errors which he labours to correct, those of Herr Von Hammer, the celebrated Orientalist of Vienna, author of a "*History of the Ottoman Empire*," and of several other works, occupy a prominent place. It is not, perhaps, generally known in this country that Von Hammer's fame for grammatical accuracy in the Oriental languages has received several shocks in Germany; since what is called a European reputation travels so slowly, that its sound often vibrates at the furthest limit of its course, long after it has ceased to be heard at the centre which gave it birth. Not to mention a huge series of "*Many hundred proofs of the gross ignorance of Herr Von Hammer*," by Von Diez, (in his "*Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien*," vol. ii. 1815,) Von Hammer's inconsiderate publication, in 1835, of Zamachshari's "*Golden Necklaces*," in the original Arabic, with a rhymed version, provoked Professor Fleischer and our Dr. Weil to administer to the Austrian court-interpreter their separate castigations, of the merited severity of which we are not aware that there has been any question among competent judges. Two years later, Von Hammer produced his "*Gallery of Bio-*

ographies of Muslim Sovereigns," (Gemäldesaal, &c.,) the first volume of which contains a life of Mohammed. It professes to be based on the most extensive array of manuscript authorities; but, in spite of its pretensions, it is often superficial and inaccurate, and affords good grounds for suspecting that the author is not quite scholar enough to cope with his sources. Two signal mis-statements in it are worth notice, because his reputation might lead the compiler of Universal Histories to adopt them on his authority. The first is, that—in his desire to assign to Waraka ben Naufal, the cousin of the Prophet's first wife Chadija, an important influence on Mohammed's religious development—he roundly asserts that he had translated the entire Old and New Testaments into Arabic. Waraka had been a Jew, and subsequently became a Christian priest; he likewise survived the Prophet's marriage with his cousin nearly eighteen years; the Traditions also mention him in such and so frequent connection with the Prophet, as to warrant the belief that this Christian may have had more influence on his knowledge of the Bible and its doctrines than all his early journeys into Syria: and, so far, Von Hammer's conclusion is legitimate and probable. But nothing more is true about his version of the Scriptures, than that he had translated into Arabic "God knows how much of the *Gospel*." The second error concerns Aïscha's celebrated adventure. Mohammed had asked Ali what he thought of the imputations against her chastity, and Ali returned an answer most explicitly declaratory of his conviction of her innocence. He reminded the Prophet that he once observed the latter, while in the act of prayer, suddenly take off one of his sandals, and cast it away; that he had conceived that that might be a new rite: but that the Prophet assured him that he only did so because the angel Gabriel had admonished him that those sandals were not clean. Now then, argued Ali *à fortiori*, if God would not suffer you to wear an unclean shoe, how can we suppose he would not warn you to put away your wife, if these imputations against her were anything but slanders? Herr von Hammer turns this answer to an opposite sense, and then boasts of having discovered a sufficient motive for the malignity with which that artful woman ever after intrigued against the noble Ali.

It is also worthy of remark, that Dr. Weil has revived the story of Mohammed's epilepsy—after Ockley, Sale, and Gagnier had, as they perhaps thought, laid it at rest. The Byzantine historians first broached this charge; and Hottinger and Marracci found plain allusions to it in the 73rd and 74th Suras of the Koran: in which the words "wrapped up," and "covered," were supposed to depict his state during a paroxysm. It was further known from Abulfeda, that his second nurse, Hulaima, brought him back to his mother, and desired to resign her charge, because the child was possessed by Satan: and that attacks of epilepsy were ascribed to the agency of evil spirits, is well known. Moreover, a passage, cited by Ockley, had shown that, when the inspiration came upon him, he heard the sound as of a bell, and likewise that he fell into a profuse sweat. But it was reserved for Dr. Weil to adduce, from the most authentic Traditions, a complete series of proofs that he was liable to repeated attacks of a kind of convulsion, the symptoms of which do certainly quadrate very remarkably with those of epilepsy. These passages distinctly declare that, when a revelation descended to him, he fell into a deep swoon as if he were dead, looked like a drunken man, and uttered a cry as of a young camel; while his eyes became red, or were closed, foam covered his face, and a profuse sweat broke out on his person. After these facts, it seems no longer questionable that what was once repeated as a calumny against an arch-impostor—as not resting on sufficient evidence—is now established by something like adequate proof. It is due to Dr. Weil, however, to add that, although he thinks Mohammed's visions were generally connected with epileptic fits, he is nevertheless so far from supposing that he merely feigned the appearances of the angel Gabriel as a screen for his malady, that he, on the contrary, admits that it was rather his paroxysms which induced him to believe in those appearances himself.

We have, indeed, already absolved Dr. Weil from the suspicion of any animosities against Mohammed; nevertheless, we are not altogether satisfied that his general estimate of his character, either as Prophet or as the originator of a great social revolution, is quite as liberal—as

apologetic, so to speak—as the data would allow. We do not charge him with the omission or exaggeration of facts, in any sense; but we feel that he often omits to dispose the excusing accidents which the circumstances of his position present, in as favourable a light as they will often fairly bear. It is not at all necessary that we should believe that Mohammed was the apostle of God, in order to pass a just sentence on his conduct in so trying a situation: but it is requisite that we should forget for a while the foregone conclusion of disbelief in his pretensions; should regard him objectively, as a person acting under that persuasion himself; and should give him the advantage of a lenient consideration of all the circumstances affecting the first possession and cautious dissemination of his new religious convictions, and of the host of modifying influences which insensibly grew up out of their vigorous propagation. Even among those who are willing to take as favourable a view of the Prophet's claims as is any way compatible with the transcendent superiority of Christianity, it is not yet probable that many will agree in arriving at the same conclusion as to what his intercourse with the angel Gabriel actually was. The subject is one of pure theory; and each, according to his previous ideas about visions, illusory phantasms, religious ecstasies, epileptic seizures, and such like, will devise his own solution of this psychological enigma. But that he acted, at any rate in the beginning, under a firm persuasion that he had received a supernatural call to proclaim the unity of God, is an admission that, we think, ought long since to have been cheerfully conceded. His previous blameless character for good faith, and for a life exempt from any known stain—even from that of polygamy, amidst a nation of polygamists; his habits of frequent retirement to Mount Hara for religious meditation; his having had forty years' experience of life; his being happily married, blessed with children, and engaged in the business of commerce,—all afford presumptions that he would not be likely to jeopardize all that men hold dear for a wilful imposture and a dangerous social agitation. Let those who regard the sufferings of a martyr as any criterion of his sincerity, consider what reasonable prospect Mohammed could have then

formed of his ultimate success; when his own tribe and the large majority of the Arabs were gross idolaters, and Mecca was the chief seat of that worship; when others adhered to some form of Sabiism; and Jews and Christian sects made up the rest of the world in which he moved. Let them further weigh the slow persuasion by which he privately won over even his most intimate acquaintance—a progress so discouraging, that, in three years, the number of converts did not exceed forty, and they mostly young persons, strangers, and slaves; and then, after he had publicly announced his mission to his assembled kinsmen, in the fourth year, the urgent entreaties, the ribald jeers, the galling insults, the threats, the perils, which he had to encounter in persisting in his course. Let them, lastly, remember that his early converts were exposed to such annoyances and dangers that he himself, in the fifth year, counselled them to fly to Abyssinia; that, after he had just had an imminent hazard of life, his own tribe, the Kuraish, drew up a document, by which they bound themselves to have no further intercourse or alliance with his family; and that, when the Kuraish had come to a formal resolution to kill him, and had surrounded his house for that purpose, he was obliged to save himself, through an artifice, by the celebrated flight to Medina, in the thirteenth year. Up to that period, his tardy success in conversion, the persecutions he suffered, and the personal sacrifices of every kind which he made, amply prove that it must have been no ordinary conviction that could weather such a storm of discouragements.

This Flight—the Hijra—is the era that separates the Prophet's career into two distinct portions. In the former, we behold a man whose main doctrine is the most momentous truth, enunciated with sublime energy and with the deepest sense of adoration; whose chief demand from his converts is, that they should pledge themselves not to acknowledge any other god but God, not to steal, not to commit fornication, not to destroy infants; who abhors the use of force in religion (Sur. x. 99); and whose humility, gentleness, prudence, and yet indomitable pertinacity, accord exceedingly well with the character he professes to bear. If the latter portion of his career, unfortunately, displays him as the leader of a faction, let



us remember that his enemies made him so ; if as revengeful, after the conquest of Mecca, that the restoration of exiles is seldom a bloodless revolution ; if as cruel in extirpating idolaters, that perchance he thought of Joshua and the inhabitants of Canaan ; if greedy of spoil, and unwilling to concede the same tolerance to others as he might once have been fain to crave for himself, that even Christianity has staggered under the burden of success and power. Although many things are recorded of his doings as a political leader, during this period, and of his declarations as a Prophet, which fill us with regret for the fall of so noble a spirit, yet we look in vain for greater derelictions of his primitive course, than what can be satisfactorily accounted for from the temptations of his altered position. He was an Arab clansman amidst a nation of clans ; and here he was, perhaps insensibly, plunged into all the trials which beset the leader of a faction, which was forced to struggle for its very existence, and for the precious right to its own honest convictions. Success in his predatory excursions and battles, the increase of his adherents, and the excess of their homage, changed his heart. The movement which he had originated, assumed a course which he could hardly have foreknown ; and the possession of some power, the fear of losing it, and the ambition, if not necessity, of acquiring more, stifled his scruples at the adoption of unworthy means. Moreover, the conflicting interests of his partisans, among whom were not a few men of such fervid character as Omar ben al Chattab, often obliged him to shape his course according to their passions, their intrigues, and their thirst for the material spoils of his victories. And lastly, he was so far intoxicated by his elevation, and by the blind credulity of his followers, that he was seduced into prostituting his prophetic office to pander to his personal interests and his lusts. We will join any one in a hearty condemnation of these weak and wicked abuses of a function which ought, at any rate, to have been sacred in his own eyes ; but we must first stipulate that the last ten years of surfeited ambition shall not be made the measure of his sincerity in the preceding thirteen years of persecution ; and that the same zeal which has hitherto been expended in hunting out his delinquencies, shall now

he turned also to discover the amount of temptation to which he was exposed, and the degree of moral light against which he sinned.

It might, indeed, still be asked, if he was such a humble, unselfish searcher after religious truth, why did he not at once find rest for his soul in the creed of the Jews, or in that of the Christians—with several individuals of which bodies he evidently came into contact—rather than believe that the basis of both those religions was revealed to him afresh? To this it may be replied, that there is the greatest doubt whether he had any acquaintance with the Old or New Testament, as books, by his own reading; and that, in the condition into which both those religions had then fallen, if he did, originally, discern that basis at all, it was through such a mist of traditions, legends, doctrinal subtleties of distinction, and drowsy litanies, that it no longer had power to enlighten his mind or warm his heart. If the Jews had long before made their law of none effect by their traditions, the six centuries which had elapsed since that judgment was uttered had only increased the solemn trifling of their Rabbis. The Christian Church laboured under the additional distraction of diverse and opposite sects; and, as Arabia was an asylum for the heretics which were driven out by the dominant parties elsewhere, it is possible that Mohammed might have seen so great a variety of dogmatic differences, as to have been only the more bewildered as to what Christianity actually was. At any rate, however virtually the doctrine of the unity of God may have been the ultimate foundation of both, and especially of Judaism, as he knew them, there is yet no doubt that he did not consider it the foundation on which they practically rested. For he charges the Jews with making Ezra the son of God, and with reverencing their Rabbis as Lords; and the Christians with making God “the third of three.” It is to be observed, however, that Mohammed seems to have no conception of the Orthodox Trinity, and to know nothing of the spirit as a person; but that, as he understands it, the Virgin Mary occupies the second place, and thus father, mother and son form the three partners in the Godhead.

Under these circumstances, as a perverted truth is sometimes worse than utter ignorance, he might well conceive

that the restoration of the two ancient revelations to their aboriginal purity formed, with the Divine Providence, an object of as urgent moment as that of their first proclamation; and, as he could not bring himself to acquiesce in what he knew of the current Jewish and Christian doctrines, he may have been justified in believing that God might again interpose to prevent his blessings being turned into a curse.

None of these considerations, however, do more than affect the question of Mohammed's personal honesty; they do not lessen the absolute value of the religion which he founded, nor its relative superiority to the degrading idolatries which it rooted out. However short he may have fallen of our ideal of a divine messenger, he was, nevertheless, the channel of un-numbered blessings to his country. He found his people split into independent clans, always at feud with their neighbours, and with hardly any other common bonds than what sprung from their energetic language, the same habits of life in the city and the desert, and the existence of certain public fairs. He made them a united nation, bound them together by the comprehensive links of a common civil and religious law, and, by appointing a public treasury, which was charged with the maintenance of all the functionaries of the Commonwealth, as well as with the legal support of the poor, he established their first national polity. He suppressed the prevalent infanticide, *reduced* the license of polygamy below one-half of the previous number of wives, and prohibited all games of chance, and the use of intoxicating liquors. He proclaimed the unity of God in terms so emphatic that they have penetrated the whole religious life of his adherents. After twelve centuries, it is still the most prominent truth in the Muslim creed; no "developments" have overwhelmed it; the meanest peasant hears it in the muezzin's cry, and in the merest fragment of a prayer; the most brutish cannot fail to know that it is the great truth. He denounces almost everything that we should call moral evil; enjoins humanity, mercy, humility, sincerity, and chastity in word and act, as the highest virtues; and asserts the resurrection to another life, and the rewards and punishments of the judgment to come. He gave this religion without the burden of a sacerdotal caste;

he appointed no ordinances into which a priest's *opus operatum* could be foisted in ; all true believers are equally near to God ; and the Koran is the common possession of them all.

If these doctrines are but a feeble echo of the Jewish and Christian revelations, yet, as Judaism and Christianity, although they had had the exclusive occupation of the same ground for six hundred years, had both failed in silencing Heathenism, we should, at least, rejoice that, through him, the cry of There is no god but God ! did at length cast down the idols for ever. If his truth was not the light, but only its shadow, yet it was, perhaps, the highest degree of light which his people were then capable of bearing ; and, as the shadow bears testimony to the light by which it is cast, so, perhaps, his constant assurance that he came "to confirm" the two previous revelations, may, in the fullness of time, prove to have been the appointed preparation for the eager reception of "the day-spring from on high."

ART. II.—BRUNO BAUER AND THE UNIVERSITIES OF PRUSSIA.

*Gutachten der Evangelisch-theologischen Facultäten der Königlich Preussischen Universitäten über den Licentiaten Bruno Bauer in Beziehung auf dessen Kritik der Evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker. Im auftrage des vorgesetzten hohen Ministeriums herausgegeben von der Evangelisch-theologischen Facultät der Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität.*

SADLY are Universities fallen since Henry the Eighth sought their judgments on his divorce! Sadly are Doctors of Theology changed since Gerson thundered over the Papal schism! Here are six Universities which have given their decisions on one of the most momentous Theological questions of the day; but so little does the Public, and especially the English Public, interest itself in the matter, that it is only by a sort of chance that this pamphlet has reached our hands.

In 1841, Bruno Bauer, a licentiate\* of the University of Bonn, published the first part of a work embodying the opinions which he taught to his classes, on the nature of the Narrative of the three first, or Synoptical Gospels.† In this work he denied their claim to be considered historical; and while he rebutted with great force (the critics say with more success than any other author) the mythical hypothesis of Strauss, he introduced a theory of his own, namely, that the narrative is only symbolically or poetically true, being, in many respects, the creation of the self-consciousness of the authors; that is to say, of so entire a feeling, on the part of the Evangelists, of the sublime nature of Christ, that they naturally fell into

\* So called, because he had a license to teach Theology; he was what is called a "privat docent," a teacher whose income was derived from the voluntary fees of the students.

† For the information of those who are not Theological, we may state that the three first Gospels are called synoptical, because they narrate nearly the same circumstances, and often use nearly the same words; and that there has always been a difficulty to account for their differences in the midst of so many resemblances. Hence they have been thought to have been derived from some common original, which has perished, and to represent the Gospel tradition in three similar, though not entirely congruous states.

miraculous narrative, as the expression of the impress his life had made upon the world. This theory would not be so startling to the Germans as to ourselves; for among them the Rationalists, the followers of Paulus and Eichhorn, openly disavow any belief in the reality of miracles, and even their possibility, and are allowed to teach in peace. But a subtle distinction is made between these, who believe the Gospels to be, in the main, historical, and the followers of Strauss and Bauer, who believe them unhistorical. The first are a recognised class in the community, and very powerful among the Lutherans. The others are opposed both by the Rationalists and the Orthodox. To this extreme party Bruno Bauer belonged, and his heresy was undoubted. But the question lay, what was the Minister of public education to do with him? The Minister, Eichhorn, had no power to remove him; the University alone could do that; but then the Minister must move the University to its duty. To do this, was not quite so easy as appears; for public opinion runs very high in the Rhenish provinces, where Bonn is situated, against the government; and the Germans cling to their Universities as the only place where their love of liberty can be displayed. All independent action is destroyed in Prussia by the strictness of the police; and it would be hard, indeed, if thought should be enslaved also. There was fear, too, that the Demagogues, who cry so vigorously for a constitution, would be but too happy to have this to seize upon, and the liberal newspapers would at once advocate the claims of a heretic oppressed by the government. And after all, it is probable that something like shame penetrates even Ministerial bosoms. Would there not be something unbecoming, if the Minister of a Kingdom chiefly founded by Frederic the Great, not only in policy, but in scepticism, should persecute a man because he advocated new views in Theology? However this may be, the Minister tells us that when Bauer sent him a copy of his volume, though he was unwilling to proceed against an unfinished work, he was so filled with indignation, that, as he had not the power of dismissal in his own hands, he sent immediately to the Protestant Faculty of Theology in the University of Bonn, and subsequently to those of the

other Universities of Prussia, requiring them to give answers to the two following questions:—

“What relation do the writings of the author bear to Christianity?” And,

“Whether, according to the rules of the Universities, and, in particular, of the Theological Faculties, he could be allowed the *licentia docendi*?”

The Minister thus hoped to obtain the dismissal of Bruno Bauer without difficulty. But, true to the principles of liberty, on which the fame of the Universities has been built, a majority of the Professors, including most of the distinguished ones, declared in his favour. The manner, however, in which the votes were taken by Universities, and not by individuals, gave the Minister the pretext he desired: as the Majorities of three Universities went against Bauer, two were in his favour, and one equally divided. The numbers respectively were, for his continuance as a Theological teacher, sixteen; against it, twelve. Among the majority were all the Professors of the University of Halle, which is the most celebrated school of Theology in Germany, or the world; where Gesenius (since dead), Tholuck, Wegschneider, and other well-known Theologians taught; in the Minority stands the name of Neander. The case of Bruno Bauer is by no means parallel with that of those writers who have appeared from amongst the English Unitarians, or that of Theodore Parker, in America, who have professed opinions at variance with a belief in the Christian Miracles. These are to be classed with the Rationalists of Germany, a well-established and powerful party, numbering Theologians of the first eminence. Nevertheless, as it shows the manner in which new opinions are received in Germany, and, as the subject is similar to one sometimes debated among ourselves, we shall proceed to lay before our readers a condensed report of the judgments of the Universities. These are six in number—at Berlin, Bonn, Breslau, Greifswald, Halle, and Königsberg. Of these, as we before intimated, by far the most important in the teaching of Theology, is Halle.

Before transcribing the judgment of this University, we must request the consideration of our readers for an attempt still further to condense a pamphlet of 180 pages, containing the already-compressed arguments of the first theolo-



gians of the day. If any should find our abstract too scanty, we trust they will avail themselves of the original. It should be noticed that none of these papers were written with the idea that they would be published, but were sent as private communications from the Professors to the Minister of Education. This, we think, enhances their value. They were published in consequence of the excitement and inquiry which followed the withdrawal of the *licentia docendi* from the daring critic. It will be necessary also for the reader to bear in mind how different the state of German society is from our own. The Universities are communities separated from the rest of the world, and form a sort of Republics, where more freedom is allowed than in the rest of society; and it by no means follows that, because the Professors think that a man may teach novel critical views in the University, and be allowed to train students for the church, that they would be in favour of allowing those students to *preach* the views of their Master. It is generally understood that the clergy of the Protestant churches of Germany hold very different opinions to those of their creeds and confessions. This betokens a lax view of the connection between the formation and the expression of opinion, though not more lax, perhaps, than that indicated by the practice of our own church. In Germany, indeed, as dissent is not allowed by law, the church is tolerant of great varieties of opinion, from the most strenuous Orthodoxy to the Rationalism of Paulus. Among us, the famous Thirty-nine articles, it is well understood, are not believed by many who sign them; being a creed,—

“Which our church has drawn up in a form thus articular,  
To keep out, in general, all who are particular.”

The vice can never cease till uniformity of belief among men, who think for themselves, is seen to be hopeless.

Bruno Bauer, say the Theologians of Halle, is a follower of the modern Philosophy of absolute self-consciousness (the philosophy of Hegel, which treats all things as subjective to man rather than objective), a philosophy which will not unite with Historical Christianity. But this is no proof that Bauer possesses not the spirit of Christianity, for he promises that his criticism will give men a deeper insight into the power of Christian principle, and, through

it, they will first learn the creative power of Jesus and his doctrines. He recognises Christ as one who united heaven and earth, God and man. We cannot deny, then, that this author is a Christian. For even Möhler, a strict Roman Catholic, declares that that man is a Christian who believes Christianity to be the highest step of human development, that is, the supreme absolute religion. It is no sufficient reason to drive a man out of a University that he disbelieves in the authenticity of certain books, and the reality of certain facts of Biblical History. For so did Marcion, than whom no heathen convert was more deeply imbrued with Christian feeling; so did Origen, who devoted himself with a faith, zeal, and self-devotion, surpassed by none of the Fathers, to the service of Christ; so did Schleiermacher, who restored the decaying faith of the Protestant church; and so the Quakers, a party of whom, in America, declared the History of Christ to be a mere allegory; and no one can doubt that they were penetrated with a Christian spirit; and they do not fear that the Christian cause will suffer by this process of criticism, for Luther, surely a true servant of God, affirmed that the epistle of James was an epistle of straw, and yet it retains its place in the New Testament. The life of Christian piety consists, not in holding fast the letter of Holy History, but in the spiritual following of Christ. Schleiermacher has admirably proved that the articles cannot now be understood as they were in the seventeenth century. The Faith that makes men happy is not the historical faith, but confidence in Christ as our Saviour. There is in Christianity an essential and an unessential, and the essential will not be destroyed, however the facts of Christianity may be explained away as ideal, or critically denied.

In accordance with these opinions, they recommend that Bauer should be allowed to teach, as he violates no rule of Protestantism; for the principles of Protestantism were originally negative only to Roman Catholicism, consisting in the principle of the sole authority of the Holy Scriptures in opposition to the Catholic doctrine of the authority of the Church and its traditions; and the doctrine of Faith and the righteousness that flows therefrom, in opposition to the Catholic doctrine of external offices (as mass and fasting), and the efficacy of good works.

Our churches, they continue, will be in opposition to their own principles, and deny their own life, if, while they trust to the power which dwells in the word of God, they put any hindrance to the most unlimited freedom of critical, exegetical, and dogmatical inquiry. Christ is the only head of our church, and human rule must limit itself to seeing that the Gospel is rightly taught, and the Sacraments rightly administered. The unity of the Church can never consist in the unity of faith in a complex system of dogmas of human origin, but only in a unity of spirit which leaves criticism free. Unless we deny all human authority in matters of belief, and allow that the word of God in the Scriptures is sufficient, we are not in harmony with a fundamental principle of Protestantism. Dogmas formed by Theologians, and therefore containing human reflections and science, vary with the changes of ideas, and pass away as all that is human. They state, further, that the belief in the authority of the word of God is a fundamental principle of Protestantism; and in particular that he who denies a personal God, and the personal duration of man after this life, destroys what has hitherto been considered the foundation of morality. Not agreeing with Bauer, they consider that his academical services are not useful but prejudicial. But they anticipate that much greater evils would follow his dismissal, as this severity might harden him against Christianity, and drive him to seek a literary maintenance by advocating paradoxical and extreme views. The liberal journalists, too, would celebrate him as a Protestant martyr, and he would, consequently, take a higher rank with a great part of the public than he has done heretofore, and many will pity him who have no sympathy with his views. Besides, is it not hard to punish Bauer for introducing Hegel's views into Theology, (in a one-sided manner, it is true,) when these have had so much honour ascribed to them in Prussia? The consequence of all this will be, that, if this young man is removed from his office, he will become, instead of an obscure teacher at Bonn, a well-known and much-read author.

Such is the judgment of Halle, the most renowned school of Theology in Europe; and honour to her for her opinion.

But how different is the world of Germany to our own!

With us, Theology is distasteful, and heresy odious, as it tells badly at the Elections. But Germany, unable to vent in political excitement the love of action, natural to man, dwells with the greater force on religious discussion. The German wit said, England ruled the seas, France the land, and Germany the air. It may be seen, perchance, after all, that the last is the noblest dominion, as in it is the essential element of life.

Very different is the opinion of the Faculty of Berlin from that of Halle. The Professors, however, were divided—Neander and three others voted against Bauer; Dr. Marheineke in his favour.

Those who condemn him give the following account of the essentials of Christianity. Christian faith reposes in a recognition of Christ as an historical person, according to the narrative delivered to us by the Evangelists, as a worker of Miracles, as one who was crucified, truly raised from the dead, and carried to heaven, who has revealed to us by his resurrection a personal duration in an eternal heavenly existence; a recognition of him as the person from whom alone we receive godly life, and on whom our religious consciousness is immediately dependent. Instead, say they, of this historical Christianity, Bruno Bauer will give us an ideal one, which he has framed, not out of the Scriptures, but from the stand-point of his own wild, fantastic speculation. Bruno Bauer recognises Christ as a great creative religious genius, from whom a new impulse proceeded to educate humanity; but this point of view is not the Christian, but one framed from the stand-point of Pantheistic reason, or self-deification. They next, rather unfairly, allege, that in the part (at that time not published) in which Bauer treats of the resurrection of Christ, he will teach that Christ died on the cross, and has no further a personal existence. His belief is, that the story of the resurrection is but an idea which developed itself after the death of Christ, in the bosom of the community which recognised him as the revealer of the unity of God and Man; as to them he was indeed risen again. By this treatment the evangelical history becomes, in the most fantastical manner, changed into a mere allegory, in which the consciousness of the Christian community is reflected.

On the presupposition of the certainty of the witness

which the Holy Ghost gave of the deeds, teaching and revelation of Christ, rests not only Protestant Theology, but also the use of the Holy Scriptures among the community; and if the accounts of the Evangelists are merely the product of the literary ability of their authors, mere poetry without truth, then are they (regard being had to the words of Luke, where he states that he had the accounts of eye-witnesses) mere lies.

They give it as their judgment that Bauer should not be allowed to teach Theology, as it would be raising a hostile power in the Church. We know, say they, that Protestantism rests on the right of free inquiry, and that it is particularly necessary to bear this in mind in the present critical state and changes of the Church; but the teaching of this theologian is destructive to the faith of the Church, and consequently cannot be tolerated, unless there is to be allowed an esoteric and exoteric doctrine. And what is this but to make theology an artful theory, full of lies and jesuitism? They then allude to the impertinence with which Bruno Bauer has treated the opinions of the deepest thinkers, and wisest and noblest men of the century, as showing that he is unfit for his office. Nevertheless, they conclude by requesting that, as the author is a man of distinguished ability, some other educational appointment may be given by the government, where his talents may have a useful instead of an injurious influence.

Dr. Marheineke, who appears to be a personal friend of Bauer, gave a vote in his favour, supported by the following reasons. He observes that there is a difference between Religion and Theology, and a corresponding one between Theologians and Preachers, and that the complaints against Bauer have come from those who were not Theologians, and who supposed that he was destroying Religion in introducing his Theologic Theory. From the mixing up of these two different things, great evils have occurred; as Theology has lost all freedom of inner movement, all dignity in her own department. He declares against those who decide Theologic questions by faith; and says that the Protestant Church, by its too strenuous assertion of the Scriptures against the Catholics, has rendered itself liable to the reproach of preferring the letter to the spirit.

He next defends himself from the possible charge of agreeing with Bauer, and says that Bauer has attacked his opinions in his work, and takes the opportunity of reproving the derisive manner in which the licentiate has noticed the opinions of other Theologians—though, says he, in this Bauer has had predecessors.

He founds his main defence of his friend on the ground that he had but carried to a further degree, principles already sanctioned by the best Theologians. Orthodox men, as Bengel, Knapp, and others, have been great critics. Griesbach and Eichhorn, Lachmann and Schleiermacher, and many others, were held back from no criticisms by dogmatical fears. These have made the most ingenious and most different hypotheses on the original text and sources of the Gospel narratives, and on the individuals who first wrote them; and what critic of modern times is considered an offender if he affirms, here or there, that he finds in the narrative or the thought of the Evangelists, something that is not true? Even Hugo Grotius dared to say that. Bauer's critical hypothesis of the origin of the three first gospels may be placed near Eichhorn's conjecture of an original gospel, or the Tradition-hypothesis of Schleiermacher. He supposes that the three gospels arose out of the religious consciousness of the community; and whatever we may think of the hypothesis, it is quite clear he has a right to put it forward, as it interferes with no fundamental dogma of Protestantism, and the Faith of the Church is nowhere attacked; and why is it unchristian to affirm that the first Christian communities took part in the formation of the gospels, and that the gospels are far more their work than that of the authors whose name they bear? It is to be confessed, however, that the results of Bauer's reasoning show that his principles are false. But Bauer has not been the first to broach this sort of explanation. Schleiermacher explained the history of the temptation, not as an actual event, but as an account of internal struggles, which Christ related to his disciples in the form of an allegory; and if this be allowed to Schleiermacher, surely Bauer may be permitted to say that such an idea is unworthy, that no one would select himself to be the subject of a parable, and that such an allegory could only be related of

an imagined character. This sort of criticism has been employed by a long succession of Theologians for a hundred years, and it is very hard to make an individual bear the burden of the guilt (if guilt it be) which belongs to the age.

Besides, in estimating this work, we should not overlook how much that is right, excellent, and Christian, is contained in it. Nor less the weighty arguments he has brought against the hypothesis of Strauss, although its destruction has been bought too dear. Only anxious spirits, who separate reason from faith, the spirit from the letter, can doubt the Christian principles of this book, or that its leading thoughts can be joined to a worthy representation of the personality of Christ. Schleiermacher, were he living, would have been the author's firmest supporter; for he was the most strenuous upholder of the freedom of teaching; and it is not fit that a state which once received those persecuted men, Wolf and Fichte, should draw from his rostrum a private Theological teacher. Dr. Marheineke concludes by saying, that if Bauer be wrong, it would be better to seek to guide him right, than to strike him down and destroy him; and that if the Minister finds it impossible to allow him to teach Theology, he should provide him with a Philosophical professorship, that his talents may receive another development.

The Faculty of Bonn, where the licentiate taught, enter, as might be expected, at more length into an analysis of Bauer's opinions. The greatest difficulty we experience in rendering the German, is to find corresponding English words to express their scientific phrases; our language is deficient in these. The gist of Bauer's hypothesis may, however, be rendered clear by an example:—Richard the Third, it is affirmed by some, was in reality a handsome man, and it was only the popular story which represented him as humpbacked. This, the Germans would call a story framed out of the consciousness of the people; they knew he was a murderer and a villain, and they pictured him as all that was ugly and loathsome in appearance.\*

\* Another, more fitting, example may be stated. Paul we know, 2 Cor. x. 10, was not of an imposing appearance, his bodily presence was weak. But Raphael and the painters represent him as sublime. Are they not right in violating the strict historical truth?



Bruno Bauer affirms, that the popular mind took an opposite direction with regard to Christ. Men felt that Christ was all that was divine and holy, and their fancies were busied in the contemplation of this surpassing loveliness of character, till, from the intense dwelling of thought upon his virtues, stories arose as the expression of the popular feeling, which attributed to Christ, actions and speeches which had no foundation in reality. Bauer has been led to his opinions by his philosophy. This need not excite our surprise. Philosophy is intimately concerned with the settlement of Theological questions. It is philosophy that makes the difference between the Arminian and the Calvinist. He whose philosophy leads him to believe in the depraved and fallen condition of man, is driven by necessity to the popular notion of redemption. The Utilitarian, and he who beholds in our emotions nothing but a balance of pleasure and pain, must cling to the supernatural character of Christ, and the divine authority of the Gospels, as the only means by which he can rise to a recognition of saintly truth and beauty; while he who exalts human reason and goodness to the highest point, and sees man as an image of the divine perfections, believing that truth and divine goodness are perennial, and never cease from the earth, will view as far less important the historical truth of the Gospel narratives; and they who believe that God's spirit visits all true believers, will naturally attach such an importance to God's present inspirations, as will render them less tenacious of the record of his past providence. There are men who seem to think that in the time of Christ, God visited the world; but that since, he has retired from it. We easily understand what immense importance these attach to the truth of every word of the Gospel; but believing that God now is ever present with us, and ever prompting to the divinest godliness, we cannot think that the critical labours of Strauss or Bauer, be their results what they may, will ever separate man from God, or intercept His message to the soul. The philosophy of Hegel, of which Bauer is an enthusiastic advocate, and which has guided him in his critical labours, we have seen described as the doctrine of universal Reason; by which apparently is meant that he insists principally on the Truth that God, the Infinite Reason,

interpenetrates and embraces all things, and is the source of their existence. This idea, applied to Theology, leads to the opinion that we, as well as Christ, partake, though in an inferior degree, of the Infinite Reason of God.

However, let us hear the University of Bonn. They condemn the work of Bauer, as an attempt to destroy the Historical character of the Gospel Narratives, and to represent them, not as a troubled reflex of the empirical effect of the Life of Christ, but as the free formation of the evangelical authors themselves, who were guided in their work, not by the traditions found in the community, but on the ideas which ruled in their minds. The author considers the gospel of Mark as the original gospel, where the History lies in its primary form. Luke, as the second, who used the writings of Mark, and added to them. The gospel of Matthew, as the latest, the author of which had the two others before him. The alterations of the two last proceed, not from the use of further traditional information, but are altogether pictures of the reflection of the Evangelists themselves, partly pragmatistical or artificial, and partly proceeding on errors founded on a misunderstanding of the original account, often, indeed, altering the nature of the story. Thus Luke has constructed the account, ix. 51—56, out of the notice of Mark. As also out of the speech of Christ, after the transfiguration, Mark ix. 11—13. Luke has made the story of the Message of the Baptist to Jesus (Luke vii. 18), a creation, which Mark would never have allowed, as, in his History, Christ and the Baptist never come into personal relations. So also Luke, out of the account of the Canaanitish woman and her daughter (Mark vii. 24—31), made the story of the Centurion of Capernaum and his servant (Luke vii. 1—9), a metamorphosis, such as never existed in the actual world, says Bauer; while Matthew, without perceiving that both accounts are the same, transcribes them one after the other. So Matthew, out of the speech of Simeon (Luke ii. 25), has made the story of the childhood of Christ, so far as peculiar to him. It is Luke, however, whom we have to thank for the whole preliminary history of the birth and childhood of our Lord. It is a story which has entirely sprung out of his own imagination. The account given of Matthew, by our

author, is, that he carries to the furthest extreme the qualities of the other writers. He often shows himself a spiritual composer, a dramatic artist, of the highest powers, using the labours of others in an extraordinarily beautiful manner, sometimes shortening or otherwise altering the accounts. And thus say they, Bauer runs through the whole history of our Lord; so that, in his hands, it becomes a nothing at all. Not only is the Descent of our Lord from David unhistorical, but also there remains no reason to consider Joseph as the name of Mary's husband; and the miraculous conception, which he calls that unnatural miracle, was, he says, first imagined through the intercourse of the Christians with the Heathen world, and the mixing up of their representations with the history of Christ. Christ, says Bauer, must be considered as the offspring of a veritable marriage; and we do not know that he was even the first-born. The account of the plucking of the ears of corn by the disciples, and the healing of the withered hand on the Sabbath, he calls a "Theme composed by Mark, on which the other evangelists have made variations." The healing of the demoniacs at Gadara, he treats "as a creation of the fancy, where not an atom should be treated as historical." In relating the choosing of the twelve apostles, the healing of the woman with the bloody flux, "Mark is not," says he, "in relation to others, the first author of the account; but he is the absolute first, the creator, the poet."

Yet he protests against the charge that he considers the Evangelists as deceivers, for no one would call Phidias a deceiver, though he formed the statues of heathen gods. Unconsciously and unintentionally they altered the accounts, for, in the creative moment, they did not know, as we know, that it was their own activity, excited from without, by the knowledge of their Lord, which caused them thus to represent their own development, and their increasing experience. The evidence of the Acts of the Apostles gives no warrant for the truth of the Gospel records, as he treats this work also as a free invention, where the apostles speak and act as the author of the third gospel thought it becoming that they should do;—and so the authority of St. Paul is thrown aside, as he became a

convert when the Christian community had already moulded the first elements both of their actual and their ideal world.

It appears, however, that he distinctly recognises the personality of Christ. He speaks of him as a man who shook the world, while he enlarged self-consciousness to eternity, and revealed the power over sin; in whose self-consciousness the new world-principle was revealed, and who was secure of the eternal power of his principles, and as a man of calm dignity and noble wisdom.

Bauer also believes he does honour to Truth, Humanity, and to Jesus himself, when he restores to his character the feeling of human frailty, which the defenders of Christianity have taken from him. For without this feeling, which is deepest in the noblest spirits, he might be a stone or a shadow, but not a man, who, through the power of his inner might, gave a new form to the history of the world. They give Bauer the full benefit of his own position, that he is not an opponent of Christianity, but one who endeavours to restore its true and actual power, particularly as the revival of a more living power in the Church has been owing to criticism; but, nevertheless, they give it as their vote that his system is opposed to Christianity, and leads to the worship of self and the human consciousness, instead of that humility which is recognised as the true Christian virtue.

In giving their decision against his being allowed to teach young men, who are preparing for the Church, they protest that they do not mean to infringe on the liberty which has been allowed in Germany for the last half century, and more particularly as the constitution of the government does not permit, as in England, the growth of different sects, and therefore, diversities of opinion must be allowed in the establishment. But the Protestant Church is not merely negative in regard to the Roman Catholic, but has positive dogmas which Bauer denies. After passing an encomium on some parts of his work, they notice the unworthy manner in which he has treated the most excellent Theologians of different ages, accusing them of halfness and hypocrisy; and the injurious sarcasms in which he indulges against the Theology and Theologians of all times. He has shown himself a zealous contro-

versalist in favour of the New philosophy, but he has destroyed the positive dogmas of the Church, and they conclude, as the others do, by earnestly requesting the Minister to provide some other employment for a man of so much energy, open-heartedness, and love of truth, lest poverty should cause him to send his works prematurely to the world, or even reduce him to writing for the daily papers.

The four Theological Professors of Griefswald were equally divided in opinion: the consequence was, that they sent in to the Minister two very long statements, embodying, no doubt, the debates they had had in private council. However, to avoid the repetition of arguments similar to those we have transcribed before, we will present their judgments in brief. Professors Schirmer and Finelius, whose opinions are in favour of Bauer, appear the first. They complain, in common with the rest, that they were called upon to decide on the merits of an unfinished work; the author of which, in his preface, distinctly begs that no one will decide upon its merits till it is completed. Bauer, say they, recognises Christ as a sublime and true teacher, as the Son of God, as one who saw that Man and God were one; who lived his doctrine, and died a sacrifice for it. He recognises also Christ's actual sinlessness;—so that it cannot be denied that his religious and moral views are Christian, and that his convictions stand on Christian ground. Nor do they consider his philosophy Anti-christian. To forbid his criticism would be unprotestant, and would produce only a false appearance of truth, as Christianity rests on the spirit, and not on the letter. The Historical faith is not that which brings happiness; such faith, said the fathers of the Reformation, was that only of the Devils and the Impious. The Apostle Paul by no means makes faith in a multitude of histories and accounts the saving faith, but says (Romans x. 9), "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God has raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Therefore this faith in the miracles cannot be the only true Christian faith, as it is not that which leads to salvation. Christ himself, John iv. 48, Matt. xii. 39, clearly and openly reproveth the thirst for miracles, and remarked further, that the false prophets would give great signs and

wonders, Matthew xxiv. 24. Only the whole of his spiritual life and working, only the living image of God announcing itself in word and deed, shall give witness of him; and they give it as their opinion, that Bauer has a right to protest against any account of miracles as not belonging to the Gospel. The account given of the entrance of these into the Gospel does not convict the Evangelists of dishonesty; for they, he considers, wrote the accretions of the Church as real historical data. It would be a mistake to rank the author with the free-thinkers and naturalists of former years; for he stands on an entirely different spiritual ground, and Christianity has nothing to fear from this criticism. All that is untrue will right itself by the power of the Christian spirit; the in-dwelling, unconquerable power that resides in the Scriptures. The power of the living truth of Christ victoriously destroys all that is false and inimical, and rises out of every battle to a new and clearer supremacy. In conclusion, they state that they do not desire that he be removed from his situation as teacher, and feel no fear that harm will follow if he is allowed to teach Theology—for his views are not likely to spread, and the one-sidedness of the hypothesis is its weakness.

The witness which the other two Greifswalder Professors bear against Bruno Bauer is precisely such as a council opposed to them would desire, for they destroy the historical argument on which the Professors of Berlin and Bonn rest their verdict—they begin by saying in energetic language that the Christian Faith is not the Faith in the four Evangelists but in the Gospel. But they object to Bauer that his philosophy leads him to false conception of the Nature of Religion. For it leads to nothing else than to a deification of the human self-consciousness; so that Religion becomes nothing else than a witness which our Self-consciousness bears to itself. Philosophy, says Bauer, will put an end to the vain efforts of the Theologians—and his philosophy turns all the facts of the Gospels into creations of the Fancy. They next endeavour to show that Bauer is a heretic as regards his belief in Christ. The foundation of Christianity, they say, is to believe in Christ as the Son of God, the Saviour through whom we have forgiveness of sins, and reconciliation with God,—the power of a new life, and the hope of one to come,—in a

word, it lies in the belief of the revelation of God in Christ ; it is not History without the Idea, nor the Idea without the History. But this is not the Faith of Bauer. His faith differs in nothing from that of Porphyry, who recognised Christ as a most excellent man,—but regretted that he was not a believer in Zeus. He does not receive the doctrine that Christ was sinless; for, though he teaches that Christ never sinned, he states that Christ, in order to feel pity for man, must have borne the burden of human temptations; nor does the author allow Christ to have been really the Son of God, but only to have been declared such by his followers: and they cannot comprehend how Bauer can know anything of Christ's character, when he denies the truth of the historical record.

In giving their opinion that Bauer should not be allowed to teach, they say that they do not withdraw from him the power of uttering his opinions, for the press is open,—and if he seeks to form a society of philosophers let him do so, but let him not do it under the shield of the Protestant-theological faculty. This, they say, not to destroy the liberty necessary for the Church, or to check the progressive development of truth; but because such allowance would not be liberty, but an encouragement to a measureless, extravagant, arbitrary development of theory. They conclude, however, by saying, that though the teaching of Theology should be forbidden to the author, other branches of learning may be left open to him.

The Theologians of Königsberg appear to have had comparatively little difficulty in coming to an unanimous vote, as they write only a short answer to the Ministerial questions. They regret the extreme to which Bruno Bauer has carried his criticism; but they find that he has, nevertheless, a true regard for the substance of Christianity, as a real revelation of God in Christ, which may awaken and save mankind. They see in his writings only the excess of a tendency which has long prevailed in the Protestant Church, and think that if he be dismissed, the attention of the youth of the Universities will be more than ever directed to his opinions. They think that these will be best counteracted by increased exertions on the part of other Professors to lay before the Students a correct theology, with profundity, wisdom, and a pure love of the truth.

It only remains for us now to notice the decision of the



University of Breslau. There the Faculty was divided; Drs. Hahn and Böhmer giving an opinion against Bauer, Dr. Middledorpf in his favour. The first decide against him on the ground that he denies the historical credibility of the Gospels, and hence is unfitted to have the instruction of men designed for the Protestant Church.

They do not deny that a man is fitted to teach who rejects, in some respects, the Historical groundwork. For Weisse and Wilke, opponents of Strauss, are allowed to teach, as they admit that the Gospels have an Historical basis, though they refuse assent to many of the accounts. But Strauss and Bauer ought to be repressed, as they make the Gospels entirely an affair of the imagination.

It would be well if, for the satisfaction of inquirers, the Prussian Minister were to ask these men what is the smallest amount of Historical faith that is sufficient for a teacher of Theology.

Dr. Middledorpf says, in opposition to his colleagues, that to repress Bauer will be an infringement of the liberty of which Prussia has, till now, been the shield. He cannot deny that there is some fear that Bauer would injuriously affect some young men, but he views it as a greater evil that the state should interfere to repress the opinions of any party in the Church. He says, that with Bauer's philosophical views he does not coincide,—but then, he argues it is not right to punish one man for holding the same principles for which others are honoured. And why should Prussia drive away Hegelian Theologians, while they are preferred in Würtemberg? He votes, therefore, that Bauer should be left free to teach, and hopes that if the Minister should think it right to remove him, that he will give him another appointment in the Philosophical faculty, where his talents may find a less encumbered field for their action.

We have thus conducted our readers, not, we are afraid, without some tediousness, to the close of a most important inquiry—an inquiry conducted by men, than whom none more qualified to judge on this subject by natural talent, by learning, and by the industry with which they have worked their way to eminence, are to be found in the world. The German Doctors of Theology must not be measured by the English standard—ours are sleek men, whose honours have been won by refusal to think, by a

tacit agreement with the ruling powers that they will be *safe* men, and repress all uproarious excursions of the imagination. But the Germans have won their position by daily and nightly toil, by such labours as few literary men in this country think of undergoing; and the words of such men must be valuable, especially when they speak at the head of the great educational institutions of Prussia. Perhaps the most remarkable thing we learn from this document, where every variety of opinion in Germany seems expressed, is the liberality which prevails among even the most rigid Protestants. The Professors of Halle are usually considered the most orthodox in Germany, yet they find no bill of eternal damnation against the disbelieving, they give no terrible warnings of human depravity, and arrogate to themselves no dispensation of the Divine displeasure. Berlin in former times was considered the centre of heresy and Hegelianism; now, under the violent leadership of Dr. Hengstenberg, it has altered its character, and is the most severe upon Bauer. It may be noticed, as remarkable, that there is no teacher of the Hegelian philosophy in Halle. But if Gesenius and Tholuck find that men are Christians, and to be endured as teachers of Theology, who doubt the Historical credibility of the Gospel narratives, men of inferior information should bate a little of the hot breath of their denunciation. Nor do we think that any liberal reasoner will deny that those who favour Bauer have the best of the argument. For if it was allowable in Luther to reject the Apocalypse, and to despise the Epistle of St. James, who is to restrain the criticism of Luther's followers? And to apply the argument to the state of things with ourselves: if Priestley did no wrong in pointing out Paul's inconclusive reasoning; in rejecting the account of the miraculous conception; in treating the story of the temptation as an allegory; in supposing that the Apostles and Evangelists were in error as to one of the most important parts of God's providence, namely, in the belief that sicknesses were occasioned by Demons; in believing the gospel account erroneous which describes the swine of Gadara as driven into the sea by the legion of Devils,—what rules shall be alleged, or what precepts laid down, that shall confine criticism to these important parts of Scripture? If it be allowed that there is

error in one part, who shall say there is no possibility of error in others? Who is to say to criticism, Thus far shalt thou go, and no further? We need not, however, fear for our religion, for, as the Professors of Halle observe, the essential part of the Gospels is utterly indestructible by criticism. The sublime precepts and the divine character of Christ remain the same, and must enchain the world by their Godlike loveliness. Rousseau's dilemma must ever remain true, that the Gospel Narratives, which surpass so far all the philosophy of sages, are, if untrue, more miraculous than the miracles they relate. Falsehood could never so clothe itself in the garb of godliness,—the man who had not truth in his soul, could never frame an account to surpass the writings of those who have devoted their lives to sublime undertakings. And, after all, the living man Christ must, by the nature of things, have been far superior to the portraiture given of him in the Gospels, in the same way as the moving, acting man surpasses his statue. How could the Evangelists, themselves inferior men, translate, without loss of power, into their faulty Greek, the words which Christ spoke to the multitude in their own tongue? Whatever the Gospel writers may have exaggerated, they could not have exaggerated the virtues and the teachings of Jesus. The sceptic may indeed object, that the Gospels being written in Greek for a Greek audience, may have lost many Jewish peculiarities that would have grated harshly on our ears, and the character of Christ been represented as more world-wide in its sympathies than it actually was. But how, we would ask, except upon the supposition that there was something more Godlike in the character of Jesus, than was to be found in their own history, would Greeks have been seized with a profound reverence for Jesus, and have taken an interest in his biography? This truth remains secure to us; and though from our imperfect knowledge of the how, the when, and the where, of the writing of the Gospels, we should find it impossible to disprove, by appealing to facts, the hypotheses of Strauss or Bauer, they would bring no terror to us, for they disturb not our belief that God is our Father, or Jesus Christ his Son.

We know that many of our remarks will be unpalatable to those who consider that the whole truth has already

been developed on these subjects, and that all our energies should be expended on the attempt to spread the views we already have, rather than exhausted in investigating new ones. But first of all, we should know what these old views are. Does any body pretend to say, that on all important subjects, Priestley, Lardner, Belsham, Carpenter, and Channing, thought alike? And who is to reconcile their differences? No theologian among us has been able to draw up in logical order a connected series of dogmas, or to discover such rules as shall enable the Scripture reader to separate the true from the erroneous, which all allow to be side by side, though in widely unequal proportions, in the pages of Holy Writ. Wearied out with fruitless endeavours to come to some satisfactory results, Theology of late years has gone almost to sleep with us, and those who attempt to arouse her are vehemently assailed.

We are aware that there are many good men who sigh after fixed opinions. "Come," say they, "let us get the truth definitely settled, and bequeath it to our children; and they, to theirs." Vain hope! The experience of Christianity shows that men's views have never been the same for two generations together. First, the simple teachings of the apostles were corrupted by the Asiatic philosophy, and gnosticism was the result; then it came in contact with Platonism, and the deification of Christ took place; then came the centuries of controversy, which established orthodoxy; then the growth of the Papal power, the disputes of the Schoolmen, and the persecution of Heretics; next the changes of opinion that led to the Reformation; and since the Reformation, men have sought truth from the combined influences of reason and Scripture, and one pillar of orthodoxy has crumbled after another. The progress of opinion since the split in Charles the Second's time, has been rapid enough from the orthodoxy of 1662 to the Unitarianism of the present day; and they who desire to stop, thinking that we have advanced enough, and who are weary of the eternal contest with the popular mind, know not the power of the stream in which humanity has its life. We cannot stop at will the ceaseless action of the Intellect; around us and within us are powers that will press onwards. Those who do endeavour to cease to think, and to wrap the religious facul-

ties in slumber, must be content to forego their birthright of the leadership of the Theological revolutions of England.

It is among the most remarkable spiritual phenomena of the age, that Roman Catholicism has produced the most effective living moral and Theological teachers. Father Mathew in Ireland, and Ronge in Germany, may fairly claim pre-eminence in moral influence on society over the clergy educated in Protestantism. Nor has there been any biography of the struggles of a Protestant mind, that equals in interest that of Blanco White; and since the great Fathers of the Reformation, themselves educated in the bosom of the Catholic Church, have fallen asleep, none of their followers have equalled the gigantic stature of Loyola and his early associates. The reason seems to be, that the Catholics devote themselves with more singleness of purpose to their objects. The Catholic priests have separated themselves as far as possible from all earthly ties to the service of God, and the great minds among them perform their mission nobly. But the Protestant is beset with controversy from his infancy; his mind grows up strong, it may be, but rugged, and ever more ready for argument than for calm contemplation (the best nurse of the soul). The situation of the Clergy, too, in Roman Catholic countries, is more favourable to the development of their energies; for they are subject only to the Pope, as the representative of God. But the Protestant ministry have to serve two masters, the Church and the State; and the State says to the Clergy, "Be, we pray you, all that is excellent, admirable, holy, magnificent in talent, and supreme in virtue,—but be also our most humble servants." This slavery of the Church to the State has repressed in it true nobility of mind. Nor is the case much better among Dissenters. Their speculations are paralysed by the fear of new views; every sect clings to the hope of a re-establishment of the unity of the Church, each believing its own opinions will turn out an Aaron's rod, to swallow up the rest. Hence, every novelty of opinion is hunted by all, as a spectre which diminishes the chance of the re-establishment of the Church. But it is time we should throw off this timidity, and allow our faculties full freedom of action in Theology, as in other sciences. The deepest inquiry is a thing to be

encouraged, not to be ashamed of, and undertaken in the dark. And perhaps the way ordained for us to quit this crabbed growth of Protestantism, is through criticism. Let all the powers of intellect, then, be employed fairly to fight our way through the controversies of the Christian world, not as though we thought them things hateful, and dark spots upon creation, but as the element in which we are destined to live, and we may be sure that a true philosophy will appear amid the tumult; for there never yet was a deluge, but that some Dove appeared with an olive-branch, the sign of a renewed earth and peaceful labours.

The state of opinion among ourselves has varied according to the changes of feeling in the great body of the people of England, of which we form a part. For several years past, the incubus of Evangelical and Puseyite opinions has weighed down public sentiment, and we, too, have felt the load. Now men are beginning to free themselves from tyranny, and there has been a revival of deeper inquiries among ourselves. This has filled many with dread, as proving the advance of Infidelity, Deism, Pantheism,—

“Wi’ mair o’ horrible and awfu’,  
Which ev’n to name wad be unlawfu’.”

We see no adequate ground for the alarm which has seized so many. Our belief is, that a boundless future is open to us, if we only throw off fear and negligence, and enter upon it. “Ah!” say some of our worthy, well-meaning friends, “we are already too much in advance of the age; only let us stand still upon the old path, and the multitude will come up to us.” We doubt whether our position is so advantageous as our friends imagine. Men now care but little for the controversies in which our grandfathers gained their honours. The battle-ground has changed. Let us be alive to the intelligence brought us of the fact, lest we find ourselves investing, with a Troy-like siege, some old fortress which has long been vacated, while the associate armies of our friends, and the retiring forces of our enemies, are engaging in an active encounter, of which even the sound reaches not our closed and torpid ears.

ART. III.—*Memoir of the Life of Henry Ware, Jun.* By his Brother, John Ware, M.D. 1 vol. pp. 484. Boston, 1846.

THERE is something of mystery in the manner in which impressions of character are communicated. The same image of some one man will present itself in clear form to a thousand minds, though no one of them has had such opportunities of knowledge as to be able to account for the distinctness of the conception, or for the confidence that is felt in its truth. We judge of men by the sentiment they touch or awaken in us, by the tone of feeling they somehow call into existence. We may not be able to show the origin of the feeling, or prove its justice, but in all cases its existence determines our judgments. There are men who have the power of touching the same class of sentiments in all whom they approach, whose image cannot present itself without instantly taking one colouring from the heart. This uniformity of impression, though always the mark of a decided Individuality, is yet not always found in connection with the very highest attributes. It is the sign of an intense earnestness rather than of a wide range of powers. Men of Genius break the singleness of their own image. Common minds get perplexed and confused by the variety of their aspects. They cannot comprehend, or reduce them to unity. They are apt to question the simplicity and sincerity of their moral nature, dazzled and bewildered by the quick succession of mental phases which their own experience does not enable them to follow or interpret. Whenever a man stamps one impress of himself upon his Contemporaries, when all who have any knowledge of him speak of him with one feeling, it will always be found that he is characterized by intensity of spirit, but not by that universality of genius which, however naturally allied to moral intensity, is yet too varied in its manifestations to leave a clear image in the general mind.

Henry Ware was one of those men of strong Individuality, whose spiritual nature, by its habitual earnestness and elevation, transfigures them to common minds, without any of that genius which might confuse the impres-



sion by the compass of its interests or the distance of its flights. In his own country he was better understood than Channing, and it is said in this Biography, not in so many words but by implication, that his personal influence was greater: whilst in this country, with multitudes who never saw him, and who have but a very general knowledge of his writings, his name has long been associated with the image of whatever is pure, gentle, devoted, affectionate, constraining and persuasive in a minister of Christ. He styled his friend John Emery Abbot, 'a man of the Beatitudes;' and this is the impression of himself which it was the prerogative of his nature to impart. The biography of a character of this order must be connected with the highest interest and instruction, though not of an exciting kind. Our principal object is not to review his 'Life' by his Brother, but to borrow from it whatever seems most characteristic of himself.

He was born in 1794, at Hingham in Massachusetts, where his father was then a clergyman. He was the eldest son, but the fifth child. But little appears of his early youth beyond the general fact that 'the child was father of the man,' that in his case there was nothing of that marvellous development of new qualities which so often takes us by surprise about the period of manhood. Some notices there are which are of peculiar interest for the glimpses they disclose of a simplicity of life and manners, in connection with true refinement and education, which was hereditary in his family. His grandfather is said to have maintained an extensive hospitality, and to have "brought up six sons and six daughters, on a salary of eighty pounds in money, and twenty cords of wood." This last is a constantly-occurring item in American salaries that sounds not a little strange in English ears. We have a pleasant picture of Henry Ware, when only six years old, being sent to the mill with a bag of corn on his horse's back, and returning with it when ground, with all steadiness and safety. He was a precocious child, at least in his facility of composition: though in the specimens given there is a striking absence of a childlike freshness and simplicity. They read like lifeless recollections of older people's wisdom or sermonizing. Thus at the age of eight years and a half, he writes, on the occasion of a sister's

death, in this bloodless strain—"O Martha! you have gone through your short pilgrimage, your life of troubles and afflictions:" and as long as two years and a half afterwards, writing proper reflections for his birthday, most unnaturally for a child speaks of this same death, as "the late melancholy event that has happened in the family,"—and admonishes himself that "if he lives in sin, not believing in the word of God, he shall be cast into hell, where none but devils dwell." (P. 13.)

It is clear that no child should be encouraged or permitted to keep a journal of this nature, a record of self-examination and pious reflections. Heart and Conscience will be lost in the lessons of the Memory. What can be more painful than to find a mother's death thus recorded by a child of twelve years old—

"My Mother—alas! she has been snatched away by the relentless jaws of death! But why should I lament her loss? She is doubtless happier than she could be in this world."—P. 14.

Yet the child's real feeling was most true and tender, and to his last day the memory of his mother was never far from his heart. Nine years afterwards he writes in another fashion, and the touch of nature is not to be misunderstood:—

"I have no distinct knowledge, but a general and pleasant impression of her virtues. The love I then bore her has left a savour in my heart."—P. 83.

When he was about eleven years old, his father, Dr. Ware, was chosen Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and the family removed from Hingham to Harvard. This Election marks an era in the history of the Congregational Churches of New England. Dr. Ware was considered as an Anti-Trinitarian, and from this period the articulated and unarticled portions of the religious community separated from one another, and a free Theology prevailed in the University. In due time, after a school Education unmarked by events or prognostications, Henry, at the age of fourteen, entered Harvard University, and graduated four years afterwards. Here also his course was undistinguished, though his character always secured him affection and respect.

"He did not appear," says his brother, "to aim at a very high standing as a scholar, and this principally, as I apprehend, because he had no conception that his abilities were such as to place it within his reach. I doubt if it ever entered his mind, that, even if he were disposed, he could have contended successfully for the higher honours of his class; he did not dream that such success was in his power, even had it been an object of desire. Had he believed it to be so, he would probably have both desired and sought it, and thus have been a much harder student. But he acquired knowledge easily. A moderate amount of labour enabled him to appear as well in his recitations as he wished, as well as he supposed it possible that he could, and he consequently devoted much leisure time to reading and to studies of a general character."—P. 27.

This sketch seems to us to be descriptive of him all through life. He never seems to have been a hard student, or to have had any intellectual ambition. His brother expresses the doubt whether he had ever attempted to master any one department of Knowledge, even in connection with his own profession. The chief interests of his mind were in connection with "the formation of the Christian character" amid the common conditions of human life. Even when he became Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care, he seems rather to have talked to his class out of the fullness of his heart than to have offered them any regular instruction. One such man in a College to keep the tone of feeling pure and high must have been invaluable, though a Faculty of such men would certainly have relaxed the severer efforts of intellectual culture, without which even the moral discipline of a College cannot long be sustained.

In the middle of his course he availed himself of the permission then usually given to undergraduates, to teach a school in the country during the winter months. This privilege provided the poorer students with the means of meeting the expenses of their own Education, but in his case it seems to have been used for the sake of the discipline it afforded. He was not seventeen years of age when he entered upon the temporary management of a mixed School in Beverly, which in studies and accommodations seems not have been above the rank of our Charity Schools, and was composed of men, women, and children. In a letter to his father he amusingly describes the mingled embarrassment and drollery of his new position :—

"With much difficulty I found the house of Andrew Eliot, who was to board the Schoolmaster. There awaited my arrival two of the School Committee, who gave me much sage advice, and administered many admirable admonitions, and instructions, and directions; particularly with regard to Mr. Pilsbury, who kept this school last year, whom they affirmed to be the very best master they ever knew. 'He had a most curious way of punishing his scholars! he used to talk to them and fairly shame them out on't—and he used to pinch their ears, and every body but *two* was very well satisfied with him,' &c."

"Tell L—— and M——, that they have taught me to be so polite to ladies, that I have got laughed at for it in my school; for, when one of these young ladies, my pupils, the other day came to me with her pen, I gallantly rose from my chair, and made my very best bow,—at which the boys laughed. However, I have learned here to think a little better of girls than I used to; for after they have been out, the boys never will come till they are called, but the girls always return of their own accord before their time is out."—"I feel myself more like a man in company and in school, than I expected. I really believe that there is some magic in the mighty word *Sir*, which has a potent influence in these things. But, by the way, I must say a word in blame of my schoolhouse. Such a little, dirty hole for seventy children, I never saw; we are as crowded as can be,—no comfort at all. Some of the boys have to stand out on the floor while the others write."—P. 33.

On leaving College, after graduating in 1812, he became an assistant in the Academy at Exeter, then under the care of Dr. Benjamin Abbot. Here he spent two years with great advantage to himself, and after some hesitation determined upon his future profession. At this period and all through his life his father was to him a most tender and judicious counsellor, never interfering with the biases of his own individuality, but ready ever with the aids of his experience to assist him in the difficult task of understanding rightly his mental fitnesses, and the intimations they gave of his proper destination. We do not remember a more beautiful example of the filial and paternal relations; on the one side the love and reverence of a son,—on the other, the wisdom and gentleness of a friend rather than the authority of a father. The following extract from one of his father's letters, written at this time, exhibits the tone of their intercourse:—

"I expected to have received one or two letters from you before this time; but I presume your reason for not having written is that which prevented Father Wibird from getting up before sunrise,—a mere respect, and sense of decorum,—you had too much respect for your father to write before him. That restraint will be taken off now, and you need no longer be prevented by any scruples of delicacy, &c.

"Your letter to L—— was calculated to give me some alarm. I consider there is always danger that persons naturally bashful and taciturn, when they once break through the restraints of nature and constitution, will also break over those of decorum and modesty, and go into the opposite extreme of impudence. The very effort it costs to overcome the reluctance of nature has a tendency to hurry you to an extreme; as the violent push required to open a sticking door, endangers your tumbling on your nose when it opens. I trust, however, you will have care enough to keep your centre of gravity, and good sense enough to apply to moral and practical purposes that law in physics, by which a body is disposed to move with an irregular and dangerous force, which has had a resisting power suddenly removed.

"I am sorry you find so little time for study. I should exceedingly regret your own improvement being retarded by your business, and the time greatly protracted of your qualifying yourself for your profession. From your observations the evening before you left Cambridge I inferred that your tendency was prevalently towards the study of divinity. If that be the case, you will of course bend your reading in that direction. As you teach the Testament, you will give it a more critical view than you would otherwise do. I would advise you also to write constantly on subjects connected with your studies, and on which you are reading. Remember Lord Bacon on reading, writing, and conversation,—‘the full, exact, and ready man.’”—P. 45.

Whilst at Exeter he showed the first symptoms of a morbid element in his nature. Dissatisfied with his position, oppressed with the feeling that he was unfitted for its duties, and disappointed in the hope of obtaining immediate release, he writes thus to his father:—

"If nobody springs up from some other quarter, I am inevitably fixed here for the summer,—doomed to perpetual anxiety and disappointment and chagrin. However, I must make it an occasion of moral discipline; and instead of brooding upon it with gloom and sullenness to the injury of my temper, I must try to make myself better by it; and if I can succeed in subduing all impatience, and

becoming quite content, I shall think I may be so in almost any state."

Six weeks afterwards we find him writing to his brother :

"The exercise I took in the vacation has done me a vast deal of good. It has recruited my strength and spirits, restored the tone and vigour of my mind, expelled the blue devils, and given to nymph Cheerfulness her rightful authority. Every thing around me is smiling and propitious."—P. 75.

In 1814 he returned to Cambridge to pursue his Theological studies. At that time there seems to have been no regular Theological instruction in the College, but merely a course of optional reading, under the advice of the Professor of Divinity. In less than a year he received his certificate of approbation from an Association of Ministers, which qualified him to appear as a Candidate for the Ministry, and on the first day of the year 1817 he was ordained as pastor of the Second Church in Boston, then the smallest in numbers and the least opulent of all its Unitarian Congregations. The poverty of the Congregation is said to be indicated by a fact which, however, in this country would prove comparative opulence,—namely, a salary of "twenty-five dollars a-week, and wood, not exceeding thirty cords a-year." A salary of upwards of £270, with firing, would here be considered to indicate rather a flourishing state of things. So much for the Voluntary principle, in the poorest of the Boston Congregational Churches. His salary speedily rose to £375.

Never perhaps was there a happier ministry, a pastor more loved or a people more faithfully served. The Society consisted chiefly of the middle classes; and these the modesty of Mr. Ware led him to suppose to be the most likely to profit by his teaching. At all times his thoughts were full of plans for their improvement. He valued the influence of the Pastor even more than that of the Preacher; but beyond the general expression of the fact of his constant activity in such schemes of usefulness, the biography does not enable us to form any very distinct ideas of his modes of action. He seems to have been animated by a desire to make himself the religious friend of his people, and to have trusted to the intercourses of life

to provide natural occasions for the spiritual offices of his mind. "Religious impressions were the indirect, and not the direct, purpose of his familiar visits. He had no air of formality in the houses of his parishioners, or in their sick chambers. He did not talk much, or harangue, on subjects of consolation. A few words of interest or of comfort, a few suggestions, in a mild manner and a gentle tone of voice, were all that he usually indulged in. Indeed, he felt great reluctance at the expression of feelings of any intensity; and so great was the difficulty in bringing himself to it, that he was sometimes deterred from visiting, in cases of very deep distress, from the feeling of utter incapacity to express in words anything of that sympathy which he felt."

In October 1817 he married: and here we must regret that this Life shows us so little of Henry Ware in his private and domestic relations. We make no acquaintance with his wife or his children. We see nothing of his daily life, his habits in his family, his methods of study, the disposal of his day, his pleasures and relaxations. There is nothing whatever of a formal or affected air about the biography, but still the subject of it is not familiarly shown in the relations that belong to every man. His very letters to his brothers and sisters are all didactic, and have the tone of the preacher even before he began to preach. We miss also familiar notices, direct or indirect, of distinguished men with whom professionally he must have been in constant association, and who, in a town so small as Boston, must have formed a large part of his daily interests,—Channing, Tuckerman, Follen, Father Taylor, Greenwood, Pierpoint. Of the first of these, with the exception of one Letter from himself, we hear next to nothing; of the rest, little more than a passing allusion. He is thus presented with something of an isolated air, which must have been very far from the truth of his daily life.

The only notice of his wife, and it is very welcome, is in the close of the following extract of a Letter to his friend Abbot, then in his last illness:—

"There was a time when we thought it was commanded you speedily to join the company of those who had entered on their reward, and we offered our prayers for you, fearing that they would come back empty. But we thank God for the hope, that you may



yet labour with us upon earth, and that the large company of your friends shall not yet be called to mourning. Thacher is gone, and others stand feebly in their places; so that we are doubly grateful for every one who is threatened, and yet spared. I dare say that you have felt as much thankfulness on account of the sickness itself as on account of its removal, because you must have found it a most salutary discipline; and, if *you* are a gainer, we will be satisfied. I do not know exactly how you are at present. I am hoping that ere long you will be able to show yourself to your friends here; all will give you a hearty welcome, and none more hearty than myself. I long to show you my dearest friend, &c."—P. 107.

When Mr. Ware commenced his Ministry, the distinction began to be decidedly made between the orthodox and the liberal portion of the Congregational Clergy. Mr. Ware took an active part in the controversies of the time, and for some years was the responsible editor of the "Christian Disciple," the organ of the freer Theology. He also assisted zealously in the formation of new Unitarian Societies. When at New York on a mission of this nature he wrote despondingly to Dr. Channing, who seems to have commenced the enterprise by preaching to a few persons in a private house. Dr. Channing's reply is so characteristic, and so full of his own clear, piercing, and subduing spirit, that we give it entire:—

"Boston, June 16, 1819.

"My dear Sir,

"Your Letter has been strangely delayed. I have just received it, and therefore may have seemed negligent of your request of advice and encouragement. You remember the language of the Psalmist, 'Why art thou cast down, O my soul? *Hope in God.*' I regret that you have not more to animate you; but the true use of difficulties is at once to confirm our devout submission, and to call forth conscientious exertion. There is a satisfaction in adhering to a good cause when it droops, as well as when it prospers. We have but one question to settle; Are we preaching God's truth? are we holding forth a purer system of Christianity, than that which prevails? are we inculcating doctrines which, if believed, will make men better, and fit them more surely for future happiness? If we believe this, we must not sink; for, if our convictions be true, our cause is God's, and will prevail; and, if we err, our sincere aim to serve him will be accepted, and will be overruled to good.

"Your letter discourages the hope of the speedy erection of an independent Church in New York; and I perceive you expect little from ministrations in an obscure Chapel. On this last point I cannot agree with you. If our friends have zeal enough to withstand neglect; if they love Christianity as much in an unostentatious building, (by the way, a much better one than the upper room in which Paul preached,) as in a splendid Church; if they have *made up their minds* to worship God according to their best understanding of his word, I have no fear of the result. If they have Scripture, and its Author, on their side, Providence will send them friends. My only fear is, that they are not prepared 'to take up the cross;' that the Gospel, without its worldly accompaniments, may not be enough for them; that the struggle may be an exhausting one, not being sustained by a deep feeling of the importance of their principles; and I fear this, not because I think them inferior to most men, but because the union of unconquerable zeal with calmness and charitableness of mind is so uncommon. As to their best course, I agree with you, that they should call attention to the subject of their peculiarities. Good books and tracts, exposing the error of Calvinism, would be very useful.

"As to the style of preaching, it should be *distinctive* and *earnest*. We should mark, plainly, openly, in direct language, and by strong contrast, the difference of our views from those which prevail, letting this difference appear in our discourses, on ordinary as well as on disputed subjects; *but* we should *always* let men see that we hold our distinguishing views to be important, only because they tend to vital and practical godliness. We should give them to men as means and motives to a Christian life; teaching them how to use them as helps to virtue;—and we should always assail the opposite sentiments as unfriendly to the highest virtue, and earnestly and affectionately warn men against them, as injuring their highest interests. I have but one more remark. Christ preached to the poor; and I think that no system bears the stamp of his religion, or can prevail, which is not addressed to the great majority of men.

"I do not wish to see a Unitarian Society in New York, made up of rich, fashionable, thoughtless people. I wish friends and adherents, who will be hearty and earnest; and I believe these qualities may be found mainly in the middling classes. Can no inquiry be instituted among these, to learn whether they are favourably disposed to your object?

"I wish to hear often.

"Your affectionate brother,  
"WM. E. CHANNING."

In connection with controversial preaching he gives an excellent piece of advice to his brother, which we have often thought was much needed by Unitarians, who are apt to satisfy themselves with *answering* the Trinitarian arguments, instead of placing the Unitarian doctrines on the strength of their own evidence.

"It is too great a piece of courtesy into which we have fallen, in suffering our adversaries to choose the witnesses, and being ourselves contented to show our ingenuity in proving that their testimony is not to be listened to. It is very impolitic. Every body knows that any one may find witnesses to come into court, and some evidence, pretty plausible too, may be adduced on any side of any question; and he would be a fool that would rest his cause on the contradiction which he might detect in the witnesses of the other side. The justest cause would be lost in this way; yet this is the mode which we have too much followed. *You* are not a Unitarian, because those difficulties were removed first, and the way so cleared; but because you got so settled on the opposite texts, that no counter-texts could move you, whether explicable or inexplicable."—P. 145.

In 1823 he lost his child; and less than a year afterwards the mother followed. These were his first severe afflictions. How beautiful is this letter to the sister of his wife, written about two months after her death. Two children still survived to him:—

"As to talking, I have no heart for it, and am glad to be silent.—I am too much occupied to have many hours for thinking on my situation, though there are some of a bitterness you may well imagine. Sometimes I think I have no heart, and wonder at my insensibility; at others, I know not how to support myself. I was at Mrs. May's the other evening, and Mrs. Greele sang the whole of Sir J. E. Smith's hymn, with such expression, that I was completely overcome, and could bid nobody good night. I never felt the beauty of that hymn before. I was called to a wedding last Sunday. It had not occurred to me what a scene I was to witness; and being, therefore, off my guard, when I found myself in the middle of the service, I was quite overcome, and with difficulty could command myself so as to go through. Such are some of the trials of feeling I am constantly meeting; who is there that can enter into them as you can?"

"I often think I could almost complain that you must be away from me. There is none other that has been with me as you have, or whose presence could now give me that indescribable sort of

soothing and support which is just what I want, and all that I want. But I must not indulge this. To all the world, I seem as I have always done. Nobody knows what my loss is, or what I feel in secret. There is nobody but you to whom I can tell it; and if I thought I should add to your unhappiness, I would hold my tongue. But I cannot deny myself the satisfaction of giving vent to some of my feelings. It was at the close of Sunday, and days like this, that, after the service of the day, I used to taste the full and peculiar enjoyment of domestic happiness; and at the return of this time, I cannot tell you how I feel it. What could I do without the children? They take up my time and beguile my feelings; and yet it is thinking of them that serves to aggravate the sadness of my situation.

"Dear Mary, I am not repining, or murmuring against Providence; but I shall be the easier for giving way to these expressions, and shall be the more composed to find comfort in my prayers."—P. 151.

His pastoral, or literary activity, suffered no relaxation from his private afflictions. In this year, besides his contributions to Periodicals, which were constant, he published his *Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching*, and the work which first made him known in this country, the *Recollections of Jotham Anderson*. Both these works are to be regarded, not so much as literary productions, as earnest developments of character, and records of experience. The power of extempore speaking, he regarded as an indispensable instrument of ministerial usefulness, and trained himself to the exercise by severe effort. "I have suffered," he says, "worse than Indian torture fifty times; but then I had Indian perseverance; and it is only by not flinching, that we can gain the great end at last." We must confess our agreement with him upon this subject. Nothing but the highest genius can escape the formality and cold indirectness that attend the habit of reading written sermons. The absence of the look, tones, and manner of direct personal address, the engagement of the eye with the paper, the cool air of the Essayist, are in themselves fatal to popular impressiveness. There is no example of a popular administration of religion in conjunction with written discourses. An individual, like Chalmers, or Channing, may accomplish it; but it is far beyond the reach of minds of only the ordinary intensity. Take

the most eloquent speech, and read it book in hand, and the fire and force of the natural language, which breathe meaning, sentiment, and emphasis, are apt to disappear. We are inclined largely to attribute to this cause the apparent coldness which is so commonly charged upon Unitarian preaching. We are quite sure that there is, in reality, no coldness, and that if the use of paper was banished from the pulpit, it would soon become the most fervent preaching in the country. We admit that it may be difficult, with some impossible, to acquire this power, after a long reliance upon the mechanical certainty of manuscript. But it ought to be the aim of younger men, and our colleges should not only encourage, but require its acquisition. It is idle to say that the thing is impossible; for lawyers, and members of parliament, and all popular preachers, overcome the difficulty. It is equally idle to say that it would lower the tone of thought; for this could only be the case where there was no self-respect; and it is necessary to secure a full mind and a warmed heart, in order to speak with any facility. We are confident, too, that a great deal of the tinsel of preaching is the finery of composition, the collateral suggestions of the mind when the pen is in the hand, that never would be permitted to divert a man from his straightforward career, were they to suggest themselves to him, which they seldom would do, whilst engaged in the earnestness of direct address. This dalliance is destructive of eloquence, and a literary man cannot escape from it, except by throwing away his pen, and refusing to give his fancy the leisurely guidance of that instrument. We are far from thinking that time would, or ought to be, saved by extempore preaching; for its successful performance would require severe and painful preparation; but we feel assured, that if worthily pursued and persevered in, it would, wherever the intellectual standard was high, speedily destroy the dulness of the pulpit.

In 1826, failing health, never to be thoroughly restored, induced him to try a favourite remedy, a journey on horseback, pursued as he had strength and inclination. He visited in this way the interior of New York, and gives some curious accounts of the fanatical excitement that was

then raging in that State. From Utica he writes to Mr. Gannett:—

“The great excitement which has existed for some time in this town and neighbourhood, you have probably heard of. It has been attended with occurrences of outrageous and vulgar fanaticism, such as I hope and believe have never been paralleled; and, in its whole tone, has had a tendency to render religion disgusting to sober observers. To frighten by any means, the most unwarrantable, has been the great effort; and the indecours, the breaches of good manners, the profanity and blasphemy, which have been committed, are almost incredible. The great leader is either a crazy man or an impostor: he calls himself ‘the brigadier-general of Jesus Christ,’ which is a characteristic specimen of his manner. He is copied by all the subalterns, most of whom are the young men from Auburn; who are let loose, during vacation, on the neighbouring country, being boarded, it is said, at the expense of the institution; and who go round in bands, assailing passengers in the streets, and prying into families, and, in the most impudent way, catechising and threatening.

“Let me give you a few other specimens. It is common for these young men to ask a passenger on the road, ‘Where are you going?’ He answers; and they say, ‘No, you are not.’ ‘No! what do you mean?’ ‘Why, I say you are going to hell!’ This has become a by-word among the children, a lesson of profaneness to them, who are heard rehearsing the question and answer perpetually. Some one asked the great preacher (Finney) to lend him his horse. ‘I have not any horse,’ said he. ‘No horse? Is not that your horse in the stable?’ ‘No; that’s Jesus Christ’s horse; if you are going on an errand for him, you can have him.’ One of the preachers gave out that he could get his horse removed to any place he pleased, by prayer; could pray him out of one pasture into another. When displeased, the common phrase is, ‘I will go and tell God of you,’ &c. You would hardly credit some of the stories.”

After hearing Finney himself, he gives this account of him:—

“He gave directions for the manner of praying, not so as to be accepted, but so as to produce *most effect* on the sinners present. Their prayers, he said, should be short, and they should particularly avoid all rehearsal of the divine attributes in the introduction, as this tended greatly to let down the tone of feeling.”—“He made a long speech afterwards; and I can now believe any stories I have heard of him. He has talents, unquestionable talents, but no heart;

he feels no more than a mill-stone. There is proof, which no one who sees him can resist, that he is acting a cold, calculating part. This is a harsh charge, but I cannot avoid it. His tones of voice, his violent, coarse, unfeeling utterance, his affected groanings, his writhings of his body, as if in agony, all testify that he is a hypocrite; and yet I try not to be uncharitable."—P. 181.

We take another extract from Letters written on this journey, as a specimen of the easy and pleasant humour which, it is said, abounded in him, but which not very frequently enlivens the solemn colouring of this Memoir.

"Light clothes won't disguise a parson. He can be seen through them as easily as if they were only a robe of light. You remember Virgil sweetly singeth, '*Nimum ne crede colori*;' a most poetical verse, the sense and beauty of which I now, for the first time, fully comprehend. It means, literally rendered (Dryden's version is more paraphrastic), *The priest is a ninny* (the right reading being unquestionably *ninium*) *who trusts to the colour of his clothes to keep him incog.* And the poet goes on to say somewhat about blackberries, which I need not quote; but it amounts, if I remember, to this: 'You might as well make a blackberry pass for a currant, by taking off its black coat, as turn a minister into a gentleman by the same process.' Now, I have been smelt out almost everywhere; people look at me, and stop swearing:—

'And, strut and swagger as I will,  
I'm nothing but a parson still!'

"When I was going quietly to meeting this afternoon, the minister accosted me in the street, and asked me to help him. I declined, saying, 'I am a Unitarian.' But the Presbyterian still wished it, and so I went and sat by him, or, as 'honest Will' more expressively phraseth it, 'Accoutred as I was, I plunged in;' and, when he had done his Sermon, I rose and exhorted on the same subject for ten or fifteen minutes; and, as he had done very poorly, I am verily persuaded that my sermon was better than his. The people were far more attentive, some of them shed tears, and none of them slept; neither of which facts can be predicated of the other. Will you say what will happen next? Two Sundays in a bottle-green coat, and a third in a light gray?"—P. 187.

In June 1827, Mr. Ware was married again, and his children, who for three years had been separated from him, under the care of his sisters, were brought to his own home. The year which followed, is described as one of the most useful and happy in his life, full of "those testi-



monies to the efficiency of his labours, which were to be found in the increased attention paid to his preaching, the increasing fulness of his congregation, and multiplied proofs of the consideration in which he was held by the community." Yet this man of unwearied activity, who appeared, to all who knew him, to be fast sacrificing his life in labours of love, writes thus to his wife, on his birthday. And here let us observe, that a morbid view of himself occasionally appears; and his self-accusation is always directed against those parts of his character in which he was least defective.

"This is my birth-day, and I was occupied yesterday, and last night, and this morning, in looking over my life, and into my character and heart. I would not dare to tell even you all that I have seen to mortify and shame me; and yet I have not been able to feel as I ought; and, what is worse, I fear I am too inveterate to profit by my knowledge of myself, but must go on, one of that miserable multitude who 'see the right, and yet the wrong pursue.' I never yet was satisfied with my mode of life for one year:—perhaps I may except one, the first year that I was in Exeter. But since that I have been growing worse and worse. I did think, soberly, that when I was settled down with you, I should turn over a new leaf; and I began; but, by foolish degrees, I have got back to all my accustomed carelessness and waste of powers, and am doing nothing in proportion to what I ought to do. In my standing and position I have a great responsibility. I know what people, many of them, think, and what is the view of the public. I know that I have bestowed on me power to do a great deal, and a singular facility in doing some things useful, which lay me under an obligation; and I know that I do nothing in proportion to this ability and facility. Yet other people tell me I do a great deal, and I am stupid enough to take their judgment instead of my own.

"These, dear Mary, are the morning reflections with which I open my thirty-fifth year. Will the year be any better for them? I hope so, but I fear not; for I do not *feel* the weight and solemnity of these considerations, as they ought to be felt. My heart is hardened and my conscience seared, and I expect to live and die as I am, and find that my whole reward is in this world. Dear Mary, I ask pardon for this strain; but I could not help it. Would to God I could feel all the gratitude I should for my singular blessings, and not turn them into curses. But when I see how I use them,—in a word, I am afraid that, in talking to others, and going over the words and sentiments of religion and virtue, I have lost the power to apply them."—P. 206.

After this time, broken health, with a few intermissions, cut him off from all regular labour, and at last compelled him to resign the charge of his pulpit and people. An extract from the reply of his Church, will show their appreciation of him.

"For twelve years he has given his strength, his time, his powers of mind and of body, by night and by day, to us. We believe that, in sincerity, in fidelity, in constancy, and disinterestedness, his services have been without example. He has always cared for us, for our families, and for our children, more than for himself. He has spared himself no trouble; he has omitted no occasion of doing us good. He has worn himself out in our service. And now when his health is gone, and his strength has failed, he comes to render back his office into our hands, and asks to depart in peace, that, as he can do no more for us, he may not come between us and our welfare, and we may be relieved from the burden of his support.

"In this state of things, we believe we give utterance to the single and universal feeling of his people when we say, that we cannot consent to the separation. 'We are not yet willing to give Mr. Ware up.' We therefore unanimously recommend, that our pastor be desired to remain with us; and that measures be taken for the choice of some person of piety and ability, on whom we may unite, to be his colleague; to assist him in the discharge of his duties, and share with him the burdens of his office."—P. 244.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, the distinguished but somewhat eccentric Essayist, was elected Colleague Pastor. But no mere relief could now sustain Mr. Ware, and shortly after he was obliged absolutely to resign his office, and visit Europe in quest of health. He remained abroad for nearly a year and a half, making friends wherever he went, and leaving the savour of his spirit in many hearts, but with no marked gain of strength. On his return in 1830 he entered upon the duties of his Professorship of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care, to which he had previously been elected. He published the admirable Address on the reciprocal influence of the Preacher and the Pastor, with which he opened his course of Lectures. This is one of the most characteristic of his publications; the fullest outpouring of his own tender and devoted spirit on the themes he most loved. Miss Edgeworth, with whom he had formed a friendship when in Europe, says of it: "I

cannot conceive any young man reading it, much less hearing it, without being moved to good, and moved steadily and permanently. The Address is itself the example of all it recommends with such pious, such benevolent, such persuasive eloquence,—eloquence in the highest, best sense of the word.—I think even in Ireland, and at this moment of the delirium of party spirit, such a pastor would be loved and respected, and would even be paid his tithes.”

In this year also he published his work on the “Formation of the Christian Character.” It is elementary; and betrays perhaps an excessive leaning towards the use of formal aids, machinery, and discipline, that would repel minds either of strong practical ardour, or of great breadth of view. There is an exaggerated, and somewhat professional tone in his estimate of the means of religious growth. But the earnestness of the book, its prevailing strain of tender wisdom, its devotional power, and its frequent evidence of a rich experience, commanded for it an extensive and merited popularity.

In 1833 he projected the series of publications called “The Sunday Library.” It commenced with “The Life of the Saviour,” written by himself. It is designed for young persons, and in many respects is admirably fitted for its purpose. Its single defect appears to us to be, that it is too much a narrative of the outward events, and fails to give the due prominence, by illustration and force of connection, to the character of Christ.—In the next year he commenced another series, entitled, “Scenes and Characters Illustrating Christian Truth,”—in which however he wrote nothing himself, and which, like the former, soon came to an end from the want of materials.

In the College, as before with his people, he was not satisfied with giving instructions from his desk, but formed the Class into a Benevolent Association. A notice of one of its meetings, whilst it shows the spirit in which he constantly worked, gives us a glimpse of Father Taylor, whose life has been devoted to the welfare of the Seamen of Boston.

“We had a delightful and exhilarating evening at the School last week. The Philanthropic Society, being engaged in inquiries

relative to the improvement of Seamen, invited Mr. Taylor to attend the meeting; an invitation was given to our friends in Cambridge, and the Chapel was well filled. The first evening he was unable to come, but we had excellent speaking; and, adjourning to the next night, he came and spoke excellently well, and has done real good by his visit. Such seasons for warming us are good. Our young men acquitted themselves well; and Taylor said in his address:—"I am astonished; I had heard you were all cold Christians, philosophers, *who would make the world stop to hear you think*. But there's fire amongst you,—there's fire amongst you."—P. 352.

The next work in which he was engaged was the preparation of a Memoir of Dr. Parker of Portsmouth, to be prefixed to a volume of his Sermons. In connection with this undertaking he writes thus to his son:—

"Yesterday I spent the greater part of the day in Dr. Parker's study, writing and overlooking papers.—It seems like a sacred work to sit in the chamber of a good man and see what he did while alive, and to hear from all about him of his usefulness and benevolence, and to witness proofs of his good influence on others. He was so good, so active, so disinterested, that everybody honoured and loved him, and many speak of him as their greatest benefactor. And, while I see what he has done, and how deeply his people loved and now bless him, I feel that the Ministry is the holiest and happiest work upon earth, and a good man the greatest man; and I feel ashamed to think how far I have myself come short of what I might have been, and ought to have done."

He had connected himself with the Abolitionists, and, though not approving the spirit of violence which he thought they manifested, he never withdrew from the cause they had at heart. When remonstrated with for giving an apparent sanction to their proceedings, he nobly replied:—

"1. I am in principle an Abolitionist. I see no other principle that can consist with Christianity or good policy; and much as I disapprove a great part of the doings of the Abolitionists, so long as I maintain their great principle, I shall be held just as guilty. 2. I cannot bear the execrable tyranny of public opinion, and of the newspaper press, which is now exerted to put down all freedom of thought and opinion on this subject. It is perfectly execrable and detestable, and ought to be resisted. I cannot, even in appearance, yield to it, though by so doing I should save reputation and life."  
—P. 367.

In 1835 he was the means of gathering together every member of his family in his father's house. The patriarch was saluted on the morning of the meeting with a poem, recited by the eldest of his grandchildren. We give a few verses of this playful effusion, written by his sister:—

"We are coming! we are coming!  
What a merry host we are!  
Laughing, shouting, singing, drumming,  
We are coming, Grandpapa!

"Here are Henrys, by the dozen,  
Here are Marys, half a score!  
Brother, sister, aunt, and cousin,  
We are coming,—many more!

"We are coming! Willies, Lucys,  
Annes, and Lizzies two and two;  
Frank and Robert, little *gooses*,  
We can find no mates for you.

\* \* \* \* \*

"We are coming! O believe us,  
Happy, joyful, *glad* we are!  
In your open arms receive us,  
*With your blessing*, Grandpapa!"

They dined together in one room, fifty-two in number, "of all ages, from the old man of seventy-one to the infant a few months old." This is a beautiful picture; pleasant and good to contemplate.

From this time forward he went on with a weak frame but an untiring spirit, never long without projecting some new scheme of usefulness, engaging in some plan by which his own labour might contribute to supply the wants he saw around him, or issuing some seasonable publication on Temperance, Peace, the Condition of the Times,—and this in addition to all his duties in the College, until at last he sunk under his burdens. "Accustomed," says his brother, "to refrain from complaints about his health, and never willing to plead the state of it as an excuse for omitting any exertion which he thought it his duty to make, so long

as it was possible to keep from his bed, he toiled on long after he should have relinquished all effort, and have given himself that rest which alone could have deferred the fatal event. His disposition for useful occupation, his interest in his work, never left him. Like the spent swimmer who still hopefully contends with the current that is sweeping him rapidly onward to a certain death, he too struggled manfully, striving and hoping to the very last." In 1842, he resigned his Professorship and retired to Framingham, about twenty miles from Boston. A letter from his nephew describes the last occasion of his meeting the School:—

"The lecture he gave that morning was one of a short course he had been delivering on Preaching. The subject of it was, 'Sentiment, the relation of Truth to the Imagination and Feelings.' Preach *experimentally*, not as a discourses, but as a partaker. Have religious experience. Speak from personal knowledge; otherwise there is no heartiness, no distinctness. The preacher must have felt all; have met every struggle. Then there is no embarrassment or dread of mistake. *The power of the pulpit depends on this; and this is within the reach of all.*"

We will not follow the melancholy variations of his illness. He never suffered the idea that he was totally laid aside, but formed new projects, and worked as his strength permitted. Yet he was not ignorant that the close was approaching. To his brother, Dr. Ware, he says,—“As soon as you are sure that by slow degrees or rapid, my life is coming to its end, you will tell me so. I covet the privilege of going home with my eyes open, and in a quiet state of conscious preparation, if it may be.”—He was now subject to occasional attacks of paralysis, and died on the 21st of September 1843, aged 49, old and spent before he had reached his prime. An examination after death showed that his disease had been in a softening of the brain.

The Appendix, containing a catalogue of his printed writings, is a remarkable evidence of industry. His attainments, if not profound, were extensive and various. He was no mean poet, and there is something of genius in his poetry which does not appear in his prose writings. His well-known poem, entitled, “Seasons of Prayer,” has endeared itself to many. We now take leave of this good

man. It is not needful to object to one or two places in the Memoir;—such as the Letter to his Sister, (p. 246,) presenting views of Providence with which we have no sympathy.—He was one of those to whom an irreligious life seems unnatural and shocking. His existence was passed under the sense of spiritual obligations, and in communion with God. Prayer was his “vital breath,” and works of usefulness the ends for which he held his being; and their omission or neglect he would have felt to be as direct a violation of obligations, as if he had drawn his temporal support from an office with important duties attached to it, which he failed to perform. The Life of such a man is a precious legacy. To the members of his own profession, and those who are looking to it, it is at once a noble example, a record of rich experiences, and a solemn and thrilling appeal. He being dead yet speaketh.



## ART. IV.—THE PEOPLE.

*The People*: by M. Michelet, Member of the Institute of France. Translated, with the Author's Approbation, by C. Cocks, B.L., Professor (Brevetê) of Living Languages, in the Royal Colleges of France. London: Longmans, 1846.

THE astonishing and perhaps unprecedented sale in England of M. Michelet's remarkable work on Priests, Women and Families, has secured circulation for the volume before us; which, though less exciting than the former, and containing an immensity of what (after deliberately weighing our words) we pronounce deplorable trash, nevertheless has instruction for thoughtful readers in its follies as well as in its wisdom. M. Michelet, we need hardly say, is a man of genius. He rose from the lowest ranks by his own signal abilities. His heart, we are convinced, is simple, pure and loving; and in private life he is reported to be (what his book may suggest) the most amiable of men. A soul so glowing, and an imagination so fertile, can ill rest without human objects of sublime desire; and having lost all power of believing in the Man of Sorrows as the manifestation of God, his enthusiasm has wrought out for him a new Messiah in the spiritualised ideal of Young and regenerated France. *Enthusiasm* was our word: he deprecates the naming of it *Fanaticism*: be it so. It is in any case sad and salutary to contemplate M. Michelet's own mind and sentiments. While full of contempt for groveling money-getting natures, he forces us to congratulate ourselves and all Europe, that Frenchmen are not all so spiritual as M. Michelet, and that material interests do clog and weigh down such effervescing geniuses. It might be expected, and it is the fact, that he has a strong dislike to political economists, and belongs to what has been called among ourselves "the sentimental school:" in consequence, although his statements of fact are often interesting or important, and very much of the untruth which he writes is suggestive of truth, still he is, we believe, utterly in the dark as to the alleviations or cures which the disorders admit; and would prove quite as mischievous an actor in legislation as in executive government.

On a general view, what will strike the reader of his book most, is, the evidence which it gives, that in France, as in England, the masses are no longer likely to suffer in silence, as they did in past ages. The period of their dumbness seems to be gone for ever. Their wrongs are in few respects greater, and in many are far less, than in ancient time, but happily it is no longer possible to conceal them. The inquiries instituted by Governments establish incontrovertible facts, and the publicity of the press diffuses a knowledge of them. Spokesmen rise up from among themselves, and, where it is otherwise, statesmen are become aware that the stability of nations depends on the welfare of the multitude. M. Michelet's volume might be characterised indeed as one of "lamentation, mourning and woe," as regards the universal ill estate of all classes in France: and this would lessen its authority, if he did not distinctly admit that the sufferings of the people are caused more by increased sensibility than by increased pressure. That is an unfortunate result, incident to the particular mode in which the French and English nations are working their way through, towards a happier state: a misery, which the Americans of the United States have escaped through the abundance of unoccupied land, joined with free institutions, and which the Germans may possibly avoid by the good sense of their despotic rulers. It cannot be denied, that the mere dread of famine to wife and children afflicts our artizans with miseries unknown in former ages: and it appears the extreme of inhumanity to cultivate in our people the tender sympathies without at the same time exerting ourselves to the utmost to remove the causes which will convert those sympathies into torture. In reading M. Michelet's account of the uneasy, unhealthy, or suffering state of the orders of society in France, the mind unavoidably reverts to England, even when he does *not* pointedly compare or contrast the two nations.

In M. Michelet's sentiments we confess, for ourselves, that we have for the first time understood what deep-seated causes carry off humane, thoughtful, and even philosophic Frenchmen into the current of military glory. This author's theory indeed on the subject out-herods Herod, and we are far from imputing to less imaginative

minds so transcendental a doctrine as he preaches. He is in sorrowful alarm lest France should be entirely bereft of spiritual principles, and become absorbed in mercenary, selfish, or sensual enjoyments. The male population, peasants as well as townsmen, have irrecoverably lost their old religious faith. Taste for the fine arts is not spread wide enough or deep enough to influence the mass: and the only *elevating* influence remaining in his view, is, pride and love of country. But France has nothing to boast of (nothing, at least, appreciable to common minds) but her military history: and in it M. Michelet fondly believes that there is a store of pure and true glory, capable of regenerating the souls of Frenchmen. France herself is to be the object of their faith, love and hope; her image, enshrined in their hearts, is to kindle them into grand and glowing aspirations after the highest good. And chiefly from the time when their Great Revolution burst the nation's bonds, and waked in the peasant and the poorest workman a holy zeal to deliver their fatherland from invading armies,—has the military spirit burned with its purest flame. That Revolution, in its sublime grandeur of retribution, of self-sacrifice and of hardy endurance, (in spite of the partial excesses which M. Michelet deplotes and detests,) was the truest manifestation which modern times have seen of Divinity in human nature. Universal History, through the middle ages, assures us that Christ has failed of being a bond to knit together all the world in love.

"The middle ages promised union, and gave only war. *It was necessary that God should have a second period, and appear upon earth in his incarnation of '89.* He then gave to association its form, at once the most vast and most true, that which still alone can unite us, and save the world.—Oh France! glorious mother! you who are not only ours, but *who are destined to restore every nation to liberty*, teach us to love one another in you!"—P. 137.

Regarding France, born again at the Revolution, as a new and better Messiah, who has shed her blood and given her soul for human salvation, M. Michelet almost necessarily sees flags and cannon, drums and trumpets, as her loving and life-giving emblems, to which (he earnestly insists) the associations and hearts of children ought from

their earliest years to be directed. It is his firm conviction that the wars of France (always excepting the present exterminations of Algeria) have been beneficent and disinterested exertions in the great cause of philanthropy,—and that other nations are now reaping the benefit of her superhuman magnanimity.

“If we would heap up all the blood, the gold, the efforts of every kind, that each nation has expended for disinterested matters, which were to be profitable only to the world, France would have a pyramid that would reach to heaven: and yours, O nations, all of you put together,—oh, yours! the pile of your sacrifices would reach to the knee of an infant. Do not then come and say to me, ‘How pale France is!’ *She has shed her blood for you.*—‘How poor she is.’ *For your sake she has given away without reckoning:* and having no longer anything, she has said, *Silver and gold have I none, but what I have give I unto you.* Then she gave her soul; and it is that on which you are living.”—P. 146.

“For our part, whatever happens to us, poor or rich, happy or unhappy, while on this side the grave we will ever thank God for having given us this great France for our native land. And that, not only on account of the many glorious deeds she has performed, but because in her we find especially, at once the representative of the liberties of the world, and *the country which links all others together by sympathetic ties, the initiation to universal love.* This last feature is so strong in France, that she has often forgotten herself. We must at present remind her of herself, and beseech her to love all the nations less than herself. . . . Suppose for an instant that France were eclipsed, were at an end, the sympathetic bond of the world would be loosened, dissolved and probably destroyed. *Love, that constitutes the life of the world, would be wounded in its most vital part.* The earth would enter into the frozen age, &c. &c.”—P. 141-2.

This ebullition from a French professor, is a retaliation on our academic vanity, which, ten years ago, by the pen of a Cambridge tutor, proclaimed that the whole civilization of Europe would be wrecked, if the method of tutorial instruction, prevalent in that University, were assimilated to the continental and Scotch methods.

That the army is sucking out the life-blood of France, M. Michelet not only admits, but glories in admitting.

“What are, at bottom, those two principal loads, the debt and the army, which are now crushing France? Two sacrifices that she is making to the world as much as to herself. The *debt*, is the

money which she pays it for having given it her principle of salvation, [‘the Gospel of Equality,’] the Law of Liberty that it copies in calumniating her. And the *army* of France,—is the defence of the world, the reserve which it keeps for the day when the barbarians will arrive.”—P. 146.

May we venture to ask, *does* France reserve her strength for the day of conflict to which the author several times darkly alludes?—(See, says he, that black smoke over Cronstadt and *Portsmouth*!)—Is she not squandering it prematurely by keeping up so great a force of “holy bayonets,” as he characteristically calls them? Indeed, the sarcasm levelled by him against the middle ages recoils on his own head:—he talks abundantly of love, but if his theory were carried into effect, he would desolate Europe with blood, more fatally than did a Hildebrand. He *reproaches* the French manufacturers, because their influence was exerted to keep the peace, a few years back, when Thiers and the Syrian War had blown the nation into a flame: and most evident it is, that in the very next ferment of public feeling, M. Michelet would throw all his influence into the scale of war, in the hope of conquering nations of German descent, language and affections, who have dwelt for more than a millennium on the western bank of the Rhine.

“Assuredly our great, agricultural and warlike France, with her twenty-five millions of men,—who has been good enough to believe the manufacturers,—who upon their word has kept motionless,—*who out of kindness for them did not retake the Rhine*,—has a right now to deplore their credulity. More shrewd than they, she ever believed that the English would remain English.”—P. 51.

After writing such paragraphs as this, M. Michelet can whimperingly and wonderingly bemoan, that,

“The only nation that has an important army is that which is of no account in Europe.”—P. 64.

The statement is most untrue, absurdly so: still it *is* true, that France has far less influence than M. Michelet desires.—But we are quite ashamed that a pure and affectionate mind, like his, can look to “an important army” as the cardinal thing for giving influence to a nation. He is well aware, that moral conquests are the greatest; and nothing but a national illusion hinders him from seeing

that the jealousy against France, which he imputes to aristocratical and regal prejudice, or to the meanness of stupid envy, is a result of that military spirit which he is labouring to foster, and of the inordinate army in which he glories as the salvation of men. He deeply regrets indeed that French blood is wasted against the Moors and Berbers, which he imputes to "mutual misunderstanding." *They* erroneously think the French to be the enemies of their religion, not knowing (although "Bonaparte told it them at Cairo") that,

"The French, and almost all Europe, have now cast off the yoke of idolatrous belief, which obscured the Unity during the middle ages."—P. 118.

Moreover M. Michelet, being a sentimental man, cannot bear to think of extirpating *wild* tribes, and is shocked that France should copy the example of English Puritans, whose cruel unintelligence is annihilating the American races. At the same time, he deeply regrets the loss of the French alliance with the Scotch, for no other reason, that we can conceive, but that such an alliance was a constant thorn to England, and offered to France a means of invasion. We doubt whether an Englishman lives, (unless it be some ignorant fighting Captain,) who grudges to France either Calais or Dunkirk, nay, or Normandy, or Burgundy, or Poitou, or Guienne. These provinces were once seized by violence; but the rape has been consecrated by time and by new affections, and is become a legitimate marriage. For ourselves, we have regretted that Belgium was rent away from France by the last great war, although it had been seized in the war; for the union had already been nearly cemented between people of one language and similar habits. We grieve to attribute to M. Michelet a mean sorrow that England and Scotland are indissolubly united.

One so hostile to England of course pities Ireland :—with good reason; and yet indiscriminatingly.

"Who does not see, that from east to west a shadow of death is pressing upon Europe, and that every day there is less sun: that Italy has perished, that Ireland has perished, that Poland has perished, and that Germany is bent on destruction! Oh Germany! Germany!"—P. 14.

By the author's leave, we would wish to remind him, that if ITALY has perished politically, the kings of France bore a large share of the guilt in ancient days; while, more recently, France covenanted to allow Austria to invade Naples, in return for leave to invade Spain herself:—that IRELAND is so far from having "every day less sun," that her *perishing* took place more than 150 years ago, and her national life has received in the last half century a decided renewal; while, whatever her present disorders, she is constantly becoming of more political interest and more able to enforce redress of her wrongs:—that POLAND lost her last chance of deliverance, when Napoleon, our author's hero, after using the energies of her sons in his selfish objects, betrayed all their hopes, and neglected to establish her independence. As for the author's lamentation over GERMANY, it is to us unintelligible. One thing however we see, that France is the proximate cause of despotism in Germany, and hereby aids its influence in Russia. As long as the French keep up their present menacing attitude and spirit towards the Rhenish provinces, so long the Germans will think defence from foreign invasion of more urgent importance than constitutional government. They are forced by France to keep up vast standing armies, and they have a wide-spread fear lest parliaments should be too jealous of the royal power and too parsimonious of the public money, to keep such forces permanently on foot. Herein lies the main strength of German despotism, which in most of the states would have no intrinsic power, from the day when France should disband her armies, and lay aside her coveting after the territory of other nations.—But why does not M. Michelet wail over SPAIN? Is he conscience-struck at the crimes of France?

England undoubtedly has made herself odious by refusing to trade freely with the European continent and the world at large; but M. Michelet ought to know better than to impute it to any mean jealousy against her nearest and most important neighbour. We have dealt with far worse cruelty towards our own people at home and in the colonies; and our tariffs have never been aimed against France in particular. At the same time if M. Michelet's political economy were correct, we should not deserve



blame for mere self defence : but happily it not only is *incorrect*, but is now in England notoriously so ; and we trust that a few years will soften the exasperated minds even of humbled Frenchmen towards us.

The French undoubtedly are humbled to find that they cannot cover earth and sea with armies, colonies and ships. They desire to imitate the wide grasping sway of the English ; yet they scorn the tastes, habits and institutions which have made England what she is. M. Michelet, for instance, praises to the skies the devout love of Frenchmen for their own soil, which he compares to a marriage ; and speaks with much contempt of the facility with which the English emigrate. Granting his opinion of us to be correct, and his approval of his own countrymen to be just, he ought to be satisfied with their being happy *in France*. But no : nothing will satisfy him unless they can be the gaze of all Europe. If France is really to become admired, she must make her own people happy, instead of burning to manage the affairs of the world. In short, whatever the simplicity of M. Michelet's private character, his public views are deeply tainted and corrupted by this intense vanity and longing after human admiration for his dear country, that idol of his faith. We are disposed to impute this in great measure to the popular origin, of which he is proud. He seems to have anxiously cherished every national prejudice, which the ignorant breathe as their proper atmosphere ; and to resist as a shallow "cosmopolitanism" all those better influences by which education and science soften the higher classes. If we could believe that the public affairs of France were likely to be carried on in the spirit which he so zealously preaches, we should indeed tremble for the peace of Europe. But he himself gives us hope. He complains that his countrymen declare that their faith in France is worn out as much as their faith in Christ ! They tell him that it is as impossible by an effort of the will to gain the new, as the old belief ;—a most awkward and unmanageable objection. The author indeed replies, that the rising generation must be reared from infancy in this new religion ;—must be taught, we presume, as fact, what he broadly and boldly asserts : "Christianity had promised [brotherly equality] and France has performed : " but his own book gives abundant proof that

France has *not* performed ; for he stigmatizes the present as a spurious France, degenerate from Her of the Revolution.

After all this, we fear that the reader may wonder at our regarding the work before us as worthy of notice : but we have thus far put forward only one element of the author's mind, which we now gladly leave, all pervading as it is, and proceed to some of the details of his book. It is divided into three parts, of which the first is called, Bondage and Hatred ; the second, Enfranchisement by Love, (by following) Nature ; the third, Enfranchisement by Love (of) Our Native Country. In the first, he considers separately the bondage of the Peasant, the bondage of the Factory Workman ; the bondage of the Artisan, of the Manufacturer, of the Tradesman, of the Official, of the Rich man and citizen of towns. Bondage and suffering so universal must proceed from wide-spread and simple causes. The one great cause of all, is called by him *machinism* ; by which he understands not merely machinery of wood and iron, but every species of formal and systematic action which represses or endeavours to supersede the free energies of individuals. This is so important a point, that we must let him speak for himself.

"That the ordinary ills of humanity have decreased, is my own opinion, and history sufficiently proves it : but they have diminished in a finite, while sensibility has increased in an infinite ratio. Whilst the expanded mind opened a new sphere to grief, the heart gave by love and family ties a new advantage to fortune :—dear opportunities of suffering, which no one assuredly would sacrifice. But how much more uneasy have they rendered life ! People no longer suffer from the present only, but from the future, from what *may* be. The soul, all aching in anticipation, has the sentiment and presentiment of future ill, occasionally of ills that will never happen. —To crown all this, this age of extreme individual sensibility is precisely that which, doing every thing by collective means, is the least inclined to spare the individual. Action, in every variety, is centralized in some grand power, and whether he will or not, man is drawn into this whirlwind. How little his weight is there, and what becomes of his dearest thoughts, his poignant griefs, in these vast general systems, alas ! who can tell ? The machine rolls on, immense, majestic and indifferent ; without even knowing that its petty wheels, so cruelly ruffled, are living men.

"But surely those animated wheels, which act under one and the same impulse, know each other? Surely their necessary co-operative relation must produce a moral relation? By no means. This is the strange mystery of this age: the period at which we act the most together is perhaps that in which hearts are least united. The collective means which places thought in common; which circulates and diffuses it; has never been greater: yet never was isolation more profound.—The mystery remains inexplicable to all who do not observe historically the progress of the system from which it proceeds. This system, to call it by one word, is, *Machinism*: let me be permitted to state its origin.

"The middle ages laid down a formula of Love, which led only to Hatred. It consecrated inequality and injustice, which made love an impossibility. The violent reaction of love and nature, called the Regeneration [Revolution?] did not found a new order, and seemed a disorder. The world, to which order was a necessary want, then said: Well! let us not love: an experiment of a thousand years is sufficient. Let us seek order and strength in the union of powers: we shall find machines which will keep them united without love; which will frame, and hold men so fast, nailed, riveted, and screwed together, that though detesting one another, they will act together.—And then they reconstructed administration machines, analogous to those of the old Roman empire, a bureaucracy *à la Colbert*, armies *à la Louvois*. These machines had the advantage of employing man as a regular power,—life, without its caprices and inequalities. . . . . Political machines, to make our social acts uniformly those of an automaton, to relieve us from patriotism; commercial machines, which, once created, multiply monotonous products *ad infinitum*, and which by the art of one day dispense with our being artists every day."—P. 75.

"Let us sum up this history:—The state, without Fatherland: industry and literature, without art: philosophy without research: humanity without man.—How can we be surprised if the world suffer, and no longer breathe under this pneumatic machine? It has found means to do without what is its soul, its life; I mean, Love. . . . . [Through machinism] the moral power of association has lost all that mechanical concentration had gained. Wild isolation even in co-operation itself; ungrateful contact without either will or heat:—which is felt only by the roughness of the friction. The result is not indifferences as one might suppose, but antipathy and hatred; not the mere negation of society, but the reverse; society actively endeavouring to become unsociable."

The evil principle here described is not regarded by M. Michelet as peculiar to France, but in fact, if we under-

stand him aright, was copied from England; in whose track, he bitterly complains that France is following. In this light we shall regard the whole passage, in the comments which we shall presently offer.

Concerning the French peasants he makes an historical statement of great moment—if correct,—that the disasters endured from time to time by the nobility have been the source of emancipation and happiness to the peasantry. First, the exhaustion of the nobles under Louis XI. forced them to sell their lands, and vast numbers of the poor purchased small lots: the effect of which was gradually shown in their wide-spread well-being and contentment, although the royal name of *good Louis the Eleventh* carried off the credit of it. Next, from the religious wars and other disturbances at the end of the 16th century, the peasant again after severe suffering was enabled to buy land with advantage. In ten years time the aspect of France was changed; in twenty or thirty, all the estates had doubled or trebled their value, and *good Henry IV.* and *great Richelieu* are supposed to be the authors of the public prosperity. But about 1650 the nobles found means to redeem much of the land, and the taxes were increasingly thrown off from them on to the peasant; whose condition constantly declined until the great Revolution. Since then, the Courts of Law have perpetually aided the rich in amassing properties [by enabling mortgagees to enforce repayment of debts?], and with success so fatal, that in the author's deliberate judgment the laws must be altered, if France is to be saved. What are the particular changes which he deems necessary, we have not been able to gather.—Under correction however from those who have more detailed information concerning France, we venture to express an opinion (unpopular as it may be) that the *Malthusian principle* is the real difficulty under which the French peasantry are labouring. Their numbers do not increase very rapidly, yet they do increase; while the land is obstinately of the same size as before. To make it yield more abundantly, it would need to be cultivated more skilfully and more economically; but this the social condition of France does not admit. Their agriculture being as unexpansive as that of England has been, they have not, as England, had a counterbalancing advantage in the expan-

siveness of manufactures : indeed, as all the new French manufactures have been hot-house productions, forced by protecting duties, which could not be extended to foreign markets,—we cannot wonder if they have signally endured the miseries of periodical glut and stagnation. Let us not be understood as saying with Malthus, that the rapid increase of population *must* bring about a deterioration of human supplies : we merely say, it will do so *unless* powerful agencies are at work to increase and economize the productiveness of the soil, or to secure new supplies from foreign sources not previously exhausted. If neither process is efficiently carried on, (which we apprehend is true of France,) then every addition made to the numbers of a nation must depress the scale of its abundance.

In describing the bondage and misery of the factory workers, the author most candidly and simply,—considering his prejudices,—lets out how much good machinery is doing to France. We cannot refrain from quoting the passage :—

“ In 1842 spinning was at its last gasp,—stifled : the warehouse choke-full and no sale. The terrified manufacturer durst neither work nor cease working, with those devouring machines : but usury does not stand still, he worked therefore half days, and encumbered the encumbrance. Prices were lowering ; all in vain : they lowered till cotton had fallen to six *sous*. Then something unexpected occurred. The words *six sous* aroused the people. Millions of purchasers, poor people who never bought anything, began to stir. Then we saw what an immense and powerful consumer the people is, when they begin to interfere. The warehouses were emptied in a moment : machinery began to work again with fury, chimneys to smoke. It was a revolution in France, little noted but great ; a *revolution in cleanliness* ; a sudden embellishment in the homes of the poor. Body-linen, bed-linen, table-linen, and window-curtains, —whole classes had them who had had none since the beginning of the world.

“ It is sufficiently understood without further example. Machinery, which seems an entirely aristocratical power, by the centralization of capital which it supposes, is nevertheless, by the cheapness and diffusion of its products, a very powerful agent of democratical progress. It brings within the reach of the poor a world of objects of utility, of luxury even, and of art, which they could never approach. Wool, thank God, has everywhere descended among the people, and warms them ; and silk is beginning to adorn them.

But the great and capital revolution has been *cotton prints*. It has required the combined efforts of science and art to free that rebellious and ungrateful tissue, cotton, to undergo every day so many brilliant transformations; to diffuse it everywhere, thus transformed, and put within the reach of the poor. Every woman wore formerly a blue or black gown, which she kept ten years without washing, for fear it might tear to pieces. But now her husband, a poor workman, with the value of a day's work covers her with a garment of flowers."—P. 33.

Contrast the two pictures, as drawn by M. Michelet himself. The poor peasant is so anxious to give a bit of land to every child, that he *buys with borrowed money*, and after years of struggling loses his whole property through the pressure of interest which he cannot pay. So much for his "great agricultural France." In contrast to this, the spurious manufacturing France, that ape of England, has raised the whole population a decided step of great importance, by cheaping to them the "monotonous" fabrics of dress, which in spite of himself M. Michelet cannot help admiring.—We do not make light of small landed freeholds. Heartily do we wish that they abounded among ourselves a hundred-fold: but there is a limit to their profitable multiplication or profitable division, and a country in which the land has been long fully occupied will, we believe, soon sink into misery, if the little freeholders try to make all their children freeholders. *One* son should succeed to the land; for the rest, other openings must be found. In the want of such other openings, nothing, we fear, can prevent wide-spread and permanent depression.

The characteristic of machinery which M. Michelet so graphically and feelingly deplores, that it will not rest one half minute, but demands the workman's unremitted attention,—is (at least in some of the most important occupations) undoubtedly very distressing. But this is a necessary result of the very excellence of machinery, and can hardly be regretted, when we perceive that it is only another step of the same progress by which civilized labour differs from that of the savage. The patient unflagging toil of an English peasant would perhaps kill an Ioway or a New Zealander, and at any rate would make life appear not to be worth having: yet we cannot on that account wish our nation to relapse into the unprofitable labour of

the wild man. The evil of overwork is not to be denied ; whether in factory hands, or in lawyers, physicians and statesmen. If, without serious detriment, the work itself can be made less severe or less wearisome, well : but if not, the proper remedy is, to shorten the time ; not, to recommend a less productive kind of labour, as the hand-loom in place of the power-loom. In fact, pitifully as M. Michelet paints those " real *hells of ennui*," spinning and weaving factories, where " *ever ever ever* is the unvarying word thundering in your ears from the automatic rumbling of wheels," we do not think he seriously wishes to stop these substitutes of human toil. To subject *children* indeed for many hours together to any continuous exertion, is a most serious evil, and deserves to be called a great cruelty, where it is not a question of life and death. It ought never to be so, and among ourselves we trust cannot be so permanently. When a free and steady trade shall have established itself between Europe and Asia,—between the temperate and tropical regions,—the thickly-peopled and the half-empty countries,—a great elevation will take place in the lower orders. And long before that, a nation possessing the advantages of England is assuredly able to refrain from overtaxing the energies of children. We can hardly conceive a public disgrace so monstrous to an industrious, sinewy, energetic, inventive nation,—and that, the richest on the globe,—as, to confess to the world that her labourers cannot exist except by the premature toil and exhaustion of their little boys and girls, to say nothing of the wives. That laws for *the defence of infancy* from the cruel cupidity of parents, (not, laws directed against factories or mines alone,) are urgently wanted, we make no doubt : but as jurisprudence is scarcely known in England as a science, this, as a thousand other things, is likely to be wrought out only by dint of countless sufferings.

In M. Michelet's statements concerning " the bondage of the manufacturer," we find chief stress laid upon the fact that (in France) he works at his own responsibility, yet mainly with borrowed capital. It appears extraordinary that this should be the general system, and that men should be so imprudent as to engage to pay a fixed rate of interest on the loans (as we understand M. Michelet to assert), after the abundant experience there has been that



every trade suffers severe crises of periodic distress. He proceeds to tax his countrymen with having brought on themselves a grievous retribution by extensive mercantile fraud.

"As to commerce, the manufacturers [after 1815] traded as if they were in a hostile country: they treated the purchaser just as the female shopkeepers ransomed (?) the Cossacks in 1815. They sold at false weight, false die, false measure. They thus played their cards very quickly, and retired, having shut France out from her best markets, compromised for a lengthened period her commercial reputation, and, what is more serious, done the English the essential service, not to mention other points, of estranging from us a whole world, Spanish America, the imitator of our Revolution." —P. 48.

This passage may exhibit some of the influences which estrange M. Michelet's generous mind from commerce, and make him lean to the sentiment, that "France is more fitted to manufacture than to sell." While we are sure that he fully believes the truth of his statement last quoted, we cannot persuade ourselves that the impression which it leaves is correct. Is he aware, that in new markets, sellers must of necessity sell for what they can get? No common measure yet exists, by which it can be found out whether a bale of silk or cotton is *worth* 50 or 100 jars of oil. Money may sometimes give, even at first, a vague idea; but many vacillations of the scales, much bargaining and higgling, are needed, to settle the market in stable equilibrium. From want of extended experience, the French merchants may at first have been more wild in their dealings than the English; but we think it impossible that they can have been permanently driven out of any markets, except by an actual inability to compete with us; —an inability, either natural and real, or inflicted on themselves by unwise legislation.

The crises suffered by French manufacturing industry are reckoned by M. Michelet as occurring in 1818, 1825, 1830, 1836, 1842; which so nearly coincide with those of England,—differing only as the rise of the same tide reaches different coasts an hour sooner or later,—as strikingly to show how identical are the interests of French and English industry. Their manufacturers and

ours are in no other sense enemies, than are the silk-workers of Spitalfields and of Macclesfield, the clothiers of Gloucestershire and of Yorkshire. Undoubtedly old Hesiod's verse has its application :—

"Potter has a spite against potter, and carpenter against carpenter :"  
yet no one questions that the members of one trade have common interests as truly as mutual rivalry ; and it is by this alternate attraction and repulsion that society co-exists. If M. Michelet would open his heart more towards the English, as a nation, this would set his understanding right in many things. It is not as individuals that he dislikes us, nor is he totally unable to speak of us with respect ; for in one passage he certainly does style us the "great English nation." Yet as if greatness were too much to ascribe without qualification, he elsewhere associates us with Russia, (a state wholly the reverse of England,) as "two *feeble, bloated* giants, which impose an illusion on Europe," p. 15. For ourselves, we do not quarrel with him that he desires France to develop her own tendencies and not become a servile imitator of England. Let each copy from the other what is good, but copy in a liberal and discerning spirit, adapting and modifying whatever is borrowed, as the genius of each may require. But we do quarrel with his perpetual assumption or assertion, that our interests are opposed to theirs, and that both cannot prosper together ; or that we desire actively to cripple the strength of France. On the contrary, the richer and happier she is, and the more her commercial welfare is promoted, the more peaceful will she become, the better neighbour, and more valuable customer to us, and the more honourable in her influence on Europe. But if M. Michelet can succeed in putting down the peaceful interests of France, and exciting her military enthusiasm, he will no doubt force us to join the armed neutrality against her, and will strengthen to the utmost the eastern despotisms which he dreads.

Moreover, in spite of the good feeling which pervades his declamations against *Machinism*, he appears to us totally to mistake both as to *diagnosis* and *prognosis* of the disease. In the first place, he misinterprets the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when he makes them cry out, "Let us *not love*: let us find machines which will keep us

united without love." Whoever speaks so, speaks for himself, but is no spokesman of society at large. The true cry of nations is, "Let us not *talk of love*, but let us give and take *justice*." M. Michelet himself came to the very edge of this, in saying, "The middle-age formula of Love consecrated *injustice*, and thereby made love an impossibility." It is true; we are become convinced that love, unity, unanimity, or even concord and peace, are oftener hindered than forwarded by talking about them. We seldom hear a sermon preached on Unity, which does not practically say, "All ought to be of one mind, therefore *you* ought to be of *our* mind." The different classes of society are not at present satisfied that they receive justice from one another; and while this is the case, love cannot unite them. Love, like faith, is not to be produced by wishing, commanding or scolding; it must grow up out of favourable soil; and if it is just now scarce, we would fain learn in what golden age it was abundant. Not certainly in the middle ages, M. Michelet being judge. A change indeed has taken place, and will take place more and more. Local attachments are relaxed, because territorial interests have absorbed them. That very love of France, as a grand whole, in which M. Michelet glories, is antagonistic to the confined and often bigoted, yet deep and zealous, devotion to smaller and partial interests. We still feel a peculiar responsibility towards our own neighbourhood, and peculiar attachment to all who have permanent relations to us: but neither of the two is any longer exclusive and unchecked by other and higher duties; and the advance of *liberty* forbids so many relations to be permanent as formerly. Let us take the common case of domestic servants. They are not our vassals; they claim, and they must have, a right of separation from us, at their own will or caprice. It is in consequence impossible to feel the same concern for them, as if their union were permanent; and positive attachment of feeling is a result only of occasional lengthened service. Of this distinction also M. Michelet has some discernment, when he deplures that the rich, on hearing from the poor the claim of freedom, are apt to take them at their word, and to infer that this frees the rich from all further responsibility. Rightly interpreted, this is the true clue to the most important moral distinctions

between the dawning and setting state of society. How is it possible for the poorest classes to escape the old yoke of slavery, under one or other of its forms, unless they are allowed to change their masters at their own discretion? and how can this right be exercised, without destroying in the mind of a master that sense of permanent connection which alone alleviates the miseries of the slave? As a grown man would think it no compliment if another felt a peculiar responsibility for his health and safety, so must it be with each order of men as soon as it attains its emancipation from another class. The day is fast approaching, when our farmers will no longer be in feudal subjection to our landholders,—a consummation much to be desired, in M. Michelet's view;—and from that day forth the landholder will justly think it a foppery to hold himself responsible for the well-being of his farmers. Neighbourly kindness, and that good-will which the relation of shopkeeper and customer engenders, will be all that can be expected or desired. The plain fact then is, that we cannot win the advantages of Freedom and at the same time keep those of Slavery; and during the time of transition, while new rights are ill-understood, and new powers indiscreetly exercised, numerous difficulties will be encountered.

This also explains the "wild isolation even in co-operation itself," on which M. Michelet moralizes. It is a result of the alternate attractions and repulsions of the social system, to which we above adverted. The workman and his master have a common interest, in regard to the community; since both desire to sell at the highest price the produce of their joint work: yet their interests are opposite, in regard to the direct bargain between them, if prices remain the same. So the workmen, as individuals, are rivals in the labour-market: nevertheless, as a class, they have a common interest against the class of masters. It is not then true that there is *isolation*; but the attraction of class is become more powerful than that between employer and employed; greatly, no doubt, through interest, but yet more powerfully through sympathy. Workmen feel how weak they are, separately; and instinct teaches them to unite. Still more, with a sense of Freedom comes in a novel idea,—the honour of their Order: a spiritual abstraction for which they will often deliberately

sacrifice their immediate interests; and this is to them a new patriotism. Through the influence of free exchanges,—of civil freedom in its largest sense,—*national* war will be suppressed: its very roots will be torn out: for neighbour countries will cease to have adverse interests. Out of this must arise some weakening of the patriotic spirit, just because nations, as nations, will no longer be subject to danger. Although patriotism will always have a wide field in internal reforms and improvements, it will lose every element of antagonism to the foreigner. In place however of the war of nations, will inevitably arise the war of classes, and already we can see that the *corps d'esprit* of workmen has the same good and bad effects, spiritually and physically, as had the patriotism of the petty states of Greece. If affairs continue in their present train, the responsibility for the weak will be shifted off from their immediate superiors of another class, to the class itself of which they are members. The connection of a master and his servants is no longer permanent; therefore the moral relation is weakened, and is becoming that only of buyer and seller. But proportionably, the relationship of workmen to one another, which is permanent, is becoming closer and stronger; and out of this moral relation a new patriotism, we say, is developing itself: a principle in many respects disagreeable in its action on those around, yet as plainly resulting from civil freedom as the unpleasant activity of a meddling Greek democracy. The classes assailed by coalitions of the workmen will necessarily and justly organize themselves for defence; and cannot possibly stand towards them in more than an *amicable* relation, similar to that of neighbour states, which, though they are now at peace, know that they may at some time go to war: nor can the superior in rank affect any longer to patronize those who stand towards him on a co-ordinate footing, of independence, though not of equality.

To bemoan such a change, because it offers no sphere for certain virtues which were called out by a system which is antiquated, is impotent and puerile. It is, in fact, to bewail, that new classes of the nation are rising into manhood and independence. If it could be alleged that the older condition had been one of great happiness to the poor, regrets for the past, however unavailing, would be

prompted by humanity. But if it must be admitted that hitherto no class of the community has ever attained its rights, nor even any moderate instalment of them, until it had become strong enough to fight for them; humanity must rather rejoice in the existence of such a contest, in spite of all its inconveniences. In the face of such a conflict of interests, much as we respect the good intentions alike of M. Michelet and of many among ourselves, we must plainly say that we regard it as childishness to propose "Love" as the remedy. By all means let each individually endeavour to cherish this holy principle; but let no one imagine that it is a warrior influence, that can tame stubborn wills and inform stupid minds. Stern necessity will bring back to moderation that party which has made unreasonable demands; and after the first storms are past, the waves of the labour-market will be gradually smoothed by friction against immovable obstacles. When experience shall have thus settled between the parties what is *possible*, both will better comprehend what is *just*; after which there will be a new basis for permanent kindly intercourse, and *love* will cease to be a dream of Lubberland. But an actual measurement of force—within the limits of the law—is an inevitable pre-requisite to stable union; for as long as masses of men reason abstractedly concerning justice, they regard things impossible to be their manifest right; and only by real conflict do they learn what things are and what are not possible. The laws of commerce can no more be reversed than those of material nature.

Now in this also we totally dissent from M. Michelet's philosophy, that he speaks with mysterious horror of the unchangeable, majestic indifference to the suffering of individuals, with which *Machinism* rolls on in its imperial course. If this is an evil, then the ordinances of heaven and earth are evil. The "ruffian waves" of Ocean swallow up without pity the young, the delicate, the beautiful, the brave and the good. The plague spares not the families of the righteous: famine and drought, hurricane and earthquake, when they do come, come with broad swoop to devastate whole districts indiscriminately. If we ask why it is that the long nights of winter or the fierce heats of summer are not counted among human calamities, the reply is obvious;—because they come uniformly enough

to be counted upon : hence they merely call out human prudence and punish thoughtlessness. So too, it is not the uniformity of machinism which is to be lamented, but its occasional want of uniformity. It may be terrible in its grandeur, but it is still more beneficent, shedding, as it does, ten thousand blessings on those who would otherwise be naked savages or miserable slaves : and though, through the organization of society or the changes in the market of the world, innocent individuals are often crushed, the evil is small in comparison to the good. Undoubtedly all abrupt changes, whether revolution in the State or new inventions in machinery, involve undeserved suffering : but the latter cause, except when aggravated by meddling legislation, is an evil quite trifling in a wide survey, and will be least felt where commerce and labour has most freedom. Not all even of the great laws of the universe are without their breaches of continuity. The irregularities of the seasons, and consequent uncertainty of our harvests, will generally entail some measure of distress : yet foresight is possible, after experience has been accumulated ; and wherever, by the productiveness of its labour, a population is lifted above abject indigence, it may learn to compensate for worse by better times. All this is equally true of the unavoidable fluctuations of the labour-market. Where locomotion is so cheap and speedy, that the labourer can transfer his powers from place to place, he will become independent of this terrible Machinism, just as the sailor is of the Trade-wind,—by adapting himself to it, and by learning how to use it aright.

Nor is there a particle of justness in M. Michelet's idea that commercial men and capitalists are citizens with no stake in the country, "who on the day of revolutions will take their ledgers and cross the channel," p. 70. Perhaps there is not a sentence in his book which more signally exposes the emptiness of a sentimental economy. Of all classes of the community, it is just these which could have least hope of passing through the ordeal of a revolution unscathed. To collect their debts would be impossible, and their property is peculiarly liable to be plundered or destroyed. Nor at such a time could they, as a body, sell, to carry away the proceeds, with any more ease than one whose property was in land. On every ground, then, we believe



that those manufacturing and commercial classes whom M. Michelet dreads, are exactly the element which France needs. We trust we may add:—from the day that England abolishes her infatuated restrictions on trade, the triumph of sound commercial principles becomes certain in France.

We have not quoted in detail the author's views concerning the bondage of official persons. Here he is probably only too correct; and the case may be easily guessed. But concerning official pay, his statement will probably surprise the reader:—

"A baker's boy at Paris [when in full work] earns more than two custom-house officers, more than a lieutenant of infantry, more than many a magistrate, more than the majority of professors. *He earns as much as six parish schoolmasters.*—Shame! infamy! The nation that pays the least to those who instruct the people (let us blush to confess it) is France. I speak of the France of these days. On the contrary, the true France, that of the Revolution, declared that teaching was a holy office, and that the schoolmaster was equal to the priest. It laid down as a principle, that the first expense of the State was instruction. The Convention, in its terrible penury, wished to give fifty-four millions of francs to primary instruction, and would certainly have done so had it lasted longer. A singular age: when men called themselves materialists, but which was in reality the apotheosis of the mind, the reign of the spirit."

The statement is certainly startling: but as the French nation is constantly increasing its national debt, and its scale of taxation is one almost of permanent war expenditure, M. Michelet is not likely to see schoolmasters better paid, until the enormous expenses of his favourite war establishment shall be reduced.

It remains to say, that "the enfranchisement by Love" to which he looks, being, as we stated, twofold, is to be effected, partly by imitating children, partly by faith in France, "as a dogma and principle; and as a legend:" p. 161. To the latter we have referred at sufficient length. Of the former we may say, that it contains a great deal that is very tender and very beautiful, with many just rebukes against aristocratic pride, starch censorious morality and formal foppish intellect. There is in the writer's mind a delicate susceptibility and quickness of sense, which, joined with his intensely French feeling, must, we imagine,

give him immense influence over native readers: and this in itself invests his book with importance. As a specimen of his *mode* of attacking Roman Catholic (would that we could not also say *Protestant*!) religionism, we leave the following with the reader:—

“Is the human instinct perverted beforehand? Is man wicked from his birth? Can the infant which I receive in my arms, as it springs from its mother’s breast, be *already one of the damned*? To this atrocious question, which pains one even to write, the middle ages, without pity or hesitation, answer, Yes.—What! this creature that seems so innocent, so disarmed; to whom all nature is attached; whom the she-wolf or the lioness, in default of a mother, would come and suckle;—has only the instinct of evil, the inspiration of that which ruined Adam? What! it would belong to the devil, if we did not hasten to exorcize it! . . . . . Whilst visiting, in the month of August 1843, a few cemeteries in the neighbourhood of Lucerne, I found there a very simple and painful expression of religious terrors. At the foot of every tomb was (according to ancient usage) a holy-water vase, to guard the deceased night and day, and prevent *the beasts of hell* from coming to snatch away the body. . . . . As for the soul, alas! they had no means of defending it; this cruel fear was expressed in several inscriptions. I remained a long time before this one, without being able to tear myself away. *I am a child two years old: what a terrible thing it is for such an infant to go to judgment, and appear already before the face of God.* I burst into tears: I had caught a glimpse of the abyss of maternal despair. The poorer quarters of our large towns, those vast factories of death, where women, miserably fruitful, bring forth only to weep, give us some idea, though an imperfect one, of the perpetual mourning of the mother in the middle ages; . . . . . a world of cruel illusions, over which an infernal irony seems to hover.”

“The Church, democratical by her principle of election, was eminently aristocratical by the difficulty of her instruction. She damned the natural instinct as perverse and spoilt beforehand, and made science, metaphysics, and a most abstract formula, the condition of salvation. . . . . Thus had they overborne by metaphysical science the *simple* and the *child*. The latter, who had been so happy in antiquity, received its hell in the middle ages.”

“It required ages for reason to struggle into light; for the child to re-appear as he is, an innocent. One grieved to believe that man was hereditarily perverse. . . . . They invented for [unbaptized]

children the palliative of the Limbo, a somewhat milder hell, where they were always to hover about, weeping, far from their mothers."

"Insufficient remedies: the heart was not satisfied. With the *Renaissance* burst forth the re-action of Love, in opposition to the cruelty of their musty doctrines. It came, in the name of Justice, to save the innocents, condemned in the system which had styled itself one of Love and Grace."—Pp. 97-100.

## ART. V.—AN ESSAY ON PRIMÆVAL HISTORY.

*An Essay on Primæval History.* By John Kenrick, M.A.  
London: B. Fellowes. 1846.

THE substance of this Essay was intended to form the introduction to a larger work on the ancient history of Egypt, Assyria, and Phœnicia. But the foundation of such a history involved an inquiry into that shadowy region, which intervenes between the commencement of the human race and the appearance of trustworthy historical materials. What were the actual growths of that region, and what are the sources of our information respecting it? If nature abhors a vacuum, the curiosity of man detests a blank. The ante-historic period must be filled up with something. As *novi homines* find a genealogy indispensable, and if they have not any, must have one made; so nations must know what they did and what happened to them, before they were nations, or, in the absence of such knowledge, they must draw bills on the all-accommodating bank of imagination. There is no European family of any distinction without an ancestry, true or false; and there is no civilized nation without a history more or less fanciful in the præ-historic age. These have, for the most part, occasioned the student, if not little trouble, at least but little anxiety. He has had no hesitation in dealing summarily with the whole of this period in the case of every nation but one. He has smiled at the astronomical cycles of the Chinese and Indians, and resolved their prized antiquity into arithmetical skill. He has, indeed, striven to worm out the truth that might lie hidden beneath the fable, but he has not felt bound to take the fable as he found it. Thus we have applied the screw of rationalistic commentary to the mythic and heroic age of Greece, and have determined, if we received its facts at all, to receive them only with a reduction of stature and proportions. So has the hand of Newton, and, after it, that of Niebuhr, ruthlessly shattered, not only the Rhea Sylvian, but much of the Regal age of Rome.

The only filling up of the præ-historic period which has

claimed exemption from this kind of criticism and inquiry is that handed down to us in the venerable records of the Hebrew people. The retributory action of time is here remarkable; for this was, of all the efforts to search into the dim regions of the human unknown, the most neglected and unnoticed by those nations, then in the ascendant of civilization, whose own notions on the same hidden subject it has superseded and thrown down.

The accounting cause of this change is the conversion of the world to Christianity. The divine origin of the Gospel involved an acknowledgment of the divine origin of Judaism. Christ and the Apostles were the later and more perfect succession to Moses and the Prophets. When the canon of the New Testament was formed, the spirit of this union required the extension of a similar sanction to the canon of the Old. If Moses bare witness to Christ, Christ should reflect his sanction upon Moses. If the writings of the Old Testament foreshadowed those of the New, the writings of the New should adopt under their shield the writings of the Old. Thus came, not only the more recent and prophetic writings, but those assigned to the earlier, the legislative and historic period, to be received as of equal authority with the Gospels and the Epistles; and the documents, containing the speculations of the Hebrew people on the origin and formation of the world, and the early history of man, previous to any regular and ascertained data, became invested with divine authority, and endowed with all the bindingness of a Creed.

Thus has it come to pass that the vast ante-historic period, once free to inquiry and speculation, has become practically closed—no inquirer daring to go ostensibly in opposition to, or in deviation from, any of the lines which the Hebrew record has laid down with the strength of ramparts; and the investigations of the Linguist, the Physiologist, the Astronomer, the Ethnographer and the Geologist have been bound hand and foot by an arbitrary theological enactment—into the authority of which it becomes high time to inquire.

Candour and his subject alike required of Mr. Kenrick that he should grapple with this question. Those Historians who select a single people for their subject, have only to begin with the first traces of their appearance as a

people. Those who begin with the later epochs of general History and proceed upwards to the earlier, may pause when they like, or may divaricate in their line. But the Historian of the most ancient nations of the East—by universal belief the cradle of the human race—is of necessity to a great extent the Historian of man. Beginning with the beginning, he must ascertain, in the very outset, where and what that beginning is, and if he have before him documents of perhaps unsurpassed antiquity, and certainly of generally-received authority, he must either follow them, or state his reasons for not following them. The endeavour to ascertain, as a faithful historian, the genuine character of these writings, involved our author in the consideration of the authority, the chronology, and the truth of the earlier Bible History, and as the results to which he was driven were very different from those usually arrived at, or rather, usually avowed, he deemed it better to publish separately his thoughts on this preliminary question, that the tide of his future work might flow on unimpeded by the rocks and shoals of theological controversy.

As bespeaking attention to the future work—as bringing anything from Mr. Kenrick's pen, a little sooner than otherwise before us, we are grateful for the determination of the author; but as in some measure sanctioning the unnatural attempt to separate scientific from theological matter, and making it appear that you may treat the Bible history in one book, and the secular in another, in fact, saving the merely historical student from a question which it is more important than ever he should candidly examine—we in some degree regret the separation of this preliminary dissertation from the rest of the work. The examination of authorities is a legitimate portion of any historical undertaking, and may be conducted *pari passu* with the progress of the history itself. As it is, the Theologian perhaps will be satisfied with this treatise apart from its historical consequent; and we fear that the Historian may be so with the subsequent work, apart from its theological antecedent.

If, however, there be anything in this objection, it will be easily removed by the union hereafter, of the *disjecta*

*membra.* In the meantime it is evident that the author had an immediate, though undeclared, object, in the present particularly well-timed publication. It is intended to exercise a liberating power in directions where science is held in shackles by unfounded and uncritical canons; and a repressive power, where its appropriate severity and exactness are endangered by too great a latitude, allowed to imagination and conjecture. It is designed to give liberty, and to discourage license. It apprizes the inquirer that he must not lean with too great reliance on the catechism of primæval truths, which he has been in the habit of repeating from Genesis without a question, and that there does not exist in the Bible or out of it, any giant-form of ascertained physical and historical fact, before which all his theories must bow the knee, and with which all his inquiries and investigations must necessarily be brought into harmony. While broadly declaring to the slave of the Canon, that what he thinks is known is *not known*, he hints to the freer speculator that he must not be too ready to believe that by any other means it *can* be known. He wishes to impress on both, the absolute twilight of primæval history, which has too many rays for usurped authority, but perhaps also too few for the clear establishment of any definite historic throne.

But to the Book itself. Given the Church Proposition,—that everything within the Canon is divine and true,—all other facts and theories must tally with it, or be rejected. The result of this has been an incessant struggle between the bar thus raised by art and man's device, and the natural flow of human inquiry. As long as the questions that interested mankind were metaphysical, the sanction of scripture authority was without difficulty ensured to the most various opinions. The Canon itself containing a great diversity of view, and this being also expressed in free and popular phraseology, opinions might be to all appearance reconciled with it, which could not be reconciled with each other. Thus the paralysing effect of the Proposition upon human inquiry was not for many ages practically perceived. But when the questions which came to be discussed were physical, and the space which the Bible devoted to the most important of them was exceedingly



minute, and the language in which it expressed them of unrivalled explicitness and distinctness—then the fetter began to gall:—

“A skilful metaphysician”—says Mr. Kenrick—“might undertake to reconcile free will with predestination—a skilful commentator, St. Paul with St. James; but to reconcile the Copernican system of the universe with a phraseology founded on the belief of the revolution of the heavenly bodies around the earth, was clearly impossible.”—Preface, viii.

Nature and truth were too strong for the theologians, and though the Church Proposition apparently stood its ground, its actual defeat dated from the moment in which the Tuscan astronomer pronounced the words, “It moves.” In order, however, to preserve to it the semblance of inviolability, it was said that mere conformity with popular language respecting the phænomena of Nature was no evidence of agreement with popular belief—that though the common phraseology was used to convey intelligence to the common mind, it by no means followed that the writer who conformed to that phraseology adopted the rude ideas from which it originally arose. “A Philosopher’s ordinary language and admissions in general conversation”—says Coleridge—“or in his writings *ad populum*, are as his watch compared with his astronomical time-piece. He sets the former by the Town Clock, not because he believes it right, but because his neighbours and his cook go by it.”

On this principle the authority of Moses came out once again apparently, though no more than before really, scatheless. When time and reflection made more and more holes in this veil, it was next declared that the Scriptures were not to be brought into court as evidence on physical subjects at all, because this was a class of topics with which they only dealt incidentally, and in which they professed to give no express instruction. This was an insufficient answer, but it lasted for a time. Then came Geology, not in its crude beginnings and conjectures, but in its matured and irrefragable results—and the prop of the old Scripturalist fell from beneath him.

“It is quite clear that the intention of the Hebrew Writer was to teach the philosophy of the universe, and the history and order

of creation, according to the conceptions of his age. They may seem to us rude and simple; we may be at a loss to reconcile them with the discoveries of modern science; but we cannot doubt that his narrative was propounded and received in the full belief of its truth."—Preface, xi.

What, then, was to be done with the Church's Proposition, and the persevering inquiries of the scientific? There was yet another resource. Perhaps we did not understand the first Chapter of Genesis. It might, after all, speak the language of nature and knowledge. "In the beginning," might apply only to the first formation of the heavens and the earth; and the completion of the globe, and the creation of man, might have followed in remote subsequent ages. This has been a favourite interpretation with modern theologians, who were open to the facts of science, while they desired to adhere to the divine authority of the whole Canon: but the conjecture was not of modern origin, being, as many similar ones, "of the Fathers." In like manner, a different sense was to be given to the word "Create," and even (spite of the "evening and the morning" marking the limit to a single revolution of the earth) to the word "Day." Of such interpretations, which he dismisses with disapprobation, Mr. Kenrick truly says that they are not warranted by philosophy, nor in accordance with the obvious meaning of the writer: and in reference to these attempts generally, he observes:—

"The apparent flexibility which Scripture has exhibited in the hands of its commentators, and the contradictory opinions which have been deduced from it, may have led those who are not conversant with Hebrew philology and biblical hermeneutic, to suppose the meaning much more uncertain than it really is. No doubt, the Hebrew language and literature present greater difficulties to an interpreter than those of Greece and Rome. Job and Hosea are not of such simple and obvious construction as Homer and Euripides. It happens, however, that the portion of Scripture which relates to cosmogony and primæval history, is remarkably free from philological difficulties. The meaning of the writer, the only thing which the interpreter has to discover and set forth, is everywhere sufficiently obvious; there is hardly, in these eleven Chapters, a doubtful construction, or a various reading of any importance, and the English reader has, in the ordinary version, a full and fair representation of the sense of the original."—Preface, xiv. See also Essay, p. 45-6.

Where, therefore, Bellarmine, and after him Professor Whewell, allow the necessity of adopting *new interpretations* of Scripture, rendered necessary by new discoveries, Mr. Kenrick suggests that these Authors must surely rather mean, that "our ideas of the *authority* of certain portions of Scripture should be modified." It is with great tenderness and delicacy that our Author goes about what is, to less honest and conscientious writers, a too ungrateful task, namely, the rectifying these mistaken ideas of the authority of the primæval history in Genesis. It is but fair to his views to quote these observations :—

"Compared with the rude efforts of the most civilized people to solve the problem of the world's existence, and connect themselves by an unbroken chain with the origin of all things, the narrative of the Creation in the book of Genesis is remarkable for its sublimity and truth. It speaks a plain and simple language, ascribes everything to the benevolent purpose of one wise and omnipotent being, and relates the successive stages of creation in general harmony with the discoveries of science, though by no means with that exact accordance which has sometimes been asserted. But though such a narrative could only have been produced among a people divinely instructed in the great truths which distinguish revealed from natural religion, it has evidently received its form from the popular belief. To regard it in all its details, as the authorized history of the changes of the globe, from the time when all was 'without form, and void,' to the creation of man, would require that we should either close our eyes to the evidence of science, or adopt interpretations of the text which are not warranted by philology."—*Essay*, p. 9.

Thus reverently, and as it were unwillingly, does our Author go about his task of correcting a deeply-grounded, but most mischievous error. And nothing to our mind proves the insincerity, the duplicity, the ignorant warfare, the secret sceptical sarcasm, the obstruction to honest scientific advance, that this theory of the Church has through now so many generations occasioned, more than the fact that a cautious, learned man, of a nature more conservative than destructive, should feel himself drawn out of his reverential attitude, to tell, or rather simply to enunciate to the world, a most needful word of truth. This is one of the worst mischiefs that accrue from pious frauds of every description, that men are allowed to gather round them

so many of the props and pillars of their faith, that they cannot be recovered to the truth, without a shock to these. It illustrates well the remark of Sir James Mackintosh, when speaking of "the infatuation of those who, in their eagerness to rivet the bigotry of the ignorant, use means which infallibly tend to spread utter unbelief among the educated."

But the cosmogony of Genesis, it is well known, is not the only thing that has "exercised" the Commentators. The descent of all mankind from one pair, the immense recorded duration of ante-diluvian life, the Deluge and its accompaniments and effects, the chronology which allows only 400 years between the dispeopling of the earth and the migrations of Abraham through re-peopled countries, and lastly, the impossibility of proving the inspiration of an historical book, especially one beset with such difficulties as Genesis, combine to force from our Author the confession that the materials for primæval history found in the eleven first chapters of Genesis are not to be relied upon.

Mr. Kenrick by no means denies the possibility of mankind being descended from one pair, but he denies the possibility of their being so descended in the time usually said to have elapsed since the creation of man. It is possible that the now striking differences in complexion, form, and language, among the various races of the globe, may be accounted for by the action of such causes as have been copiously dwelt upon by Prichard and Wiseman in this country, and Blumenbach in Germany. All that Mr. Kenrick denies, is that these changes can have been effected in six, or rather four thousand years. And he evidently inclines, in opposition to these Writers, to the belief in a diversity of original stocks, unless there is allowed an immensely-increased period of time for the production of the differences which now exist. This tendency to believe rather in "the tenacity with which nature adheres to her established forms, than the flexibility with which she varies them," places him also in opposition to the Author of the *Vestiges*. "The Negro, with all his peculiarities of form, colour, and hair, appears just the same in the paintings of the age of Thothmes III., fifteen centuries before the Christian æra, as he is now seen in the interior of Africa."

"It is difficult to assign limits to the influence of climate, joined to that of soil, food, and modes of life, in producing changes in the human form. It is probable that its range was greater when civilization was less diffused, which enables man to protect himself against the injurious effects of the elements, and gives variety to his occupations, his clothing, and diet."—"In general, however, the survey of those races whose successive conditions we can ascertain, presents to us rather the proofs of the tenacity with which nature adheres to her established forms, than the flexibility with which she varies them. Still these forms are not absolutely unchangeable; we see nations whose language proclaims them to have descended from a common stock, exhibiting a different complexion and features, according to the country which they occupy, and we cannot presume to say how far this assimilating power extends. No known effect of climate is adequate to account for the existing varieties of complexion. We see no tendency in the Negro race settled in North America, to approach the colour of the Whites, though other peculiarities of the Negro are said to wear out in those who are the most perfectly domesticated. On the other hand, no tendency displays itself, in the white races established in intertropical climates, whose population is black, to approach the colour of the natives, if there be no intermarriage between them, much less to assume their osteological and physiological characters."—P. 16-18.

The objection to ante-diluvian longevity is thus stated:—

"Such a prolongation of human life is a perpetual miracle. It is contrary to all analogy that living beings, *the same in species*, should differ from each other in length of life by several centuries. When a naturalist collects the proofs of identity of species, he does not fail to include conformity in the duration of life. Beings whose lives extended to nearly 1,000 years, must have been physically, morally, and intellectually different from ourselves, whose average does not exceed three score years and ten. They cannot, therefore, have been our progenitors. If to avoid this difficulty, we suppose that *year* meant some other length of time than twelve months in this part of the history, we cut ourselves off from all possibility of establishing a chronology, the value of its unit being uncertain. If we say that there is some error in the reckoning, we undermine the authority of a document, into which we admit that so grave an error can have crept."—P. 58.

To get rid of the fatally short time allowed by the chronology of Genesis for the great changes which it records, some have preferred the authority of the Samaritan copy, and many that of the Septuagint version, to the original

Hebrew text, the Septuagint allowing upwards of 1,200 years from the Deluge to the call of Abraham, and the Hebrew only 427; and between the Creation and the call of Abraham, the Septuagint making 3,469, and the Hebrew only 2,083. But the very discrepancy is fatal to the reception of either authority,—to the Septuagint, because the variation is systematic, a hundred years being regularly added to the age of the father at the time of the birth of his eldest son, and the same number as regularly subtracted from the length of his life after that event,—and to the Hebrew, because it is manifest that the incredible and impossible nature of its chronology led to this tampering with its dates.

The result of the inquiry instituted in this succinct and learned Essay is this, that “about 3,000 years before the Christian æra is the utmost limit to which we can carry up the history of civilization,” (and this only by the help of Egyptian remains,) “and from this time to our own, the line of its descent is unbroken.” The ages previous to this date are consigned to the guardianship of Myth. The mythic period commences in different countries at different times, because the historic age begins at an earlier date among some people than among others. Egyptian monarchs were raising monuments, and making inscriptions, while Greece was, by its own account, governed by Demigods; and Odin was playing the God in Scandinavia, while philosophy (if we may not go even later, and say Christianity) was displacing Jupiter in Rome. Still the mythic period has a quasi-historic value; if we cannot learn from it what *was*, we can at least learn what was believed or imagined. If “we discard from our minds all belief in the personality and adventures of Cadmus,” we may learn from the myth that the Greeks themselves believed that they owed some of their civilization to Phœnicia. The mere myth which ascribed the buildings of Tiryns and Argos to the Cyclops, might tell us, without the testimony of any remains, that they were colossal and remotely ancient.

“What has been commonly called *conjectural* history, has been unsatisfactory, because it has proceeded upon unproved assumptions respecting the primitive condition of mankind, and has been carried out by means of doubtful analogies. But if we assume nothing ex-

cept the facts which constitute our earliest historical knowledge, and seek to explain them from the faculties and affections of man, which in all ages are the same, we shall approach as nearly to a knowledge of primæval history, as we can do in the entire absence of positive testimony."—P. 93.

The remainder of the Essay is devoted to the following out of these dark hints of the primæval history. There is a line finely drawn between the hypothesis of self-development, and the usual theory of unchanging races.

"It may be a law of Nature that the altered condition of the elements shall be slowly followed by changes of organs and structure which at length amount to specific or even generic differences; or it may have been the order of creative operation, to bring into being new races, whenever the earth, in its progress from its primæval to its present state, was prepared generally or partially to receive and preserve them. On either supposition, the correspondence between the world and its inhabitants, at any given period, is the result of adaptation; either equally excludes the absurdity of self-production. The question cannot be decided by historical evidence, but this, as far as it goes, is unfavourable to the supposition that Nature gradually exchanges one species for another. We trace nothing like a waste of power in abortive attempts to produce new forms, subsequently abandoned from their unsuitableness. We see in the present order of things, no tendency to the production of new species, nor to the extinction of the old, except by violent causes."—P. 101.

In short, there is a stamp of permanence, according to our Author, about Nature, both in the animal and the vegetable world, which disinclines him to believe that man was ever anything but man, or a potato anything but a potato. He denies us any longer the pleasant old theory that all mankind once lived by the chase, and then pastured cattle, and then grew wheat. It would depend upon whether game, or pasture, or fish, were most abundant in their several neighbourhoods.

"History does not furnish a single example of a nation emerging by its own efforts from the condition of hunters, fishers, or shepherds. Such changes have always been brought about by contact with a more civilized race, and very generally purchased by the loss of national independence, or even personal liberty."—P. 109.

And yet it is allowed that the capacity for *self-improvement* belongs to man alone—that it is the



*alle terminus hærens* which alone gives him a history; and whence did the Conquerors obtain their civilization?

With the exception of such slight indications of a pre-disposition (without which Neander maintains no man can approach any investigation), our Author has accomplished his undertaking without prejudice, or prepossession, and in the simple love of Truth. His pre-disposition is against guesses and conjectures, and he upholds in opposition the sovereignty of History and the solemnity of Fact. The Essay possesses not therefore the charm of a cleverly-imagined and ingeniously-sustained Theory. Its value consists in the absence of such a charm. Mr. Kenrick forbids Imagination to appear in the field, except *as* Imagination. He will only have two sides to all questions—what we *know*, and what we do not know. His concern is principally to make the landmark between these two—the known and the unknown—distinct and recognizable, that we may not suppose we know what in fact we do not, or that we do *not* know what in fact we do. His desire is to break off the fetters from one set of men, and place a mild hand of restraint upon another. The dose of heresy in the book is homœopathic, (the rejection as plenary and faithful history, of the eleven first Chapters of Genesis,) but it is administered with a full sense of the responsibility of the adviser, and the instant necessity of the prescription. We beg the reader not to judge of the learning and style of the Essay by the points we have brought before him. We have only touched with a current hand on the *loci communes* of the field it opens out to us, and directed no attention to its nobler qualities of thought, its exactness of diction, its easy and comprehensive learning, and its entire honesty. The book may not contain much that is strictly new to the student, but its condensation and comprehensiveness will render it a grateful offering, even to him, and an invaluable gift, if it will accept it, to that large portion of the English Public who are anxious for guidance on the deeply interesting topics of early human history. It contains almost the first thoroughly honest and out-spoken word from the learned world which they have yet had. May the mission of the Essay be accomplished! which we take to be to ensure its freedom to Investigation, and its sacredness to Truth.

ART. VI.—BUNSEN'S CHURCH OF THE FUTURE,  
AND UNIVERSAL LITURGY.

1. *Die Verfassung der Kirche der Zukunft.* (The Constitution of the Church of the Future. Practical Elucidations of the Correspondence respecting the German Church, Episcopacy, and Jerusalem. With a preface, and publication of the entire correspondence. By C. C. J. Bunsen, Doctor of Laws and Philosophy.) Hamburg: 1845. pp. 453.
2. *Allgemeines Evangelisches Gesang-und Gebetbuch zum Kirchen-und Hausgebrauch.* (Universal Hymn and Prayer Book, for the Use of the Evangelical Church and Home.) Hamburg: 1846. pp. 1032.

THE name of Bunsen, as a profound and conscientious investigator of Egyptian history and chronology, has already appeared in our pages. We meet with him now under a new character. In the works of which we here give the titles, we find him returned from the dim realms of antiquity, into the broad, clear daylight of life and reality—not addressing himself to the studious few, but writing with deep earnestness on a subject which attracts the notice of myriads, and which he justly designates as “one of the vital questions of the Present, not only in Germany, but in most countries of Europe.”—(P. 8.) The Church of the Future!—There is, perhaps, not a topic to which considerations of more thrilling interest attach, or on which thoughtful minds are at this moment more intently exercised. We turn, then, with feelings of mingled curiosity and respect to the deliberately-expressed opinions of a scholar, a politician, and a man of the world, who assures us, that, for five-and-twenty years, it has been the constant object of his studies, historical and theological, to arrive at a well-defined and self-consistent idea of the constitution of the Church and its relation to the State (p. 13), and who to a mind naturally serious and devout (for so we interpret the internal evidence of his works)—well exercised in the philosophical speculations, and fed with the solid erudition, of Germany—has added that knowledge of affairs, and acquaintance with the various aspects of European society,

which only a career like his, occupying at different times posts of influence and responsibility in the courts of Rome, London, and Berlin, can be conceived to render attainable.

The occasion of his work he has described in the preface. A writer, named Abeken, had published, at the request of the King of Prussia, for the satisfaction of the German public, an account of the proceedings jointly engaged in, some three or four years ago, by England and Prussia, relative to the establishment of a Protestant bishopric at Jerusalem.\* Abeken's book was sent by the Chevalier Bunsen to his friend Mr. W. E. Gladstone, who expressed himself pained by the views which it exhibited, as conveying an erroneous impression of the constitution of the Anglican Church, and as contrary to the published statements of the Bishop of London on the same transactions. A friendly correspondence between Bunsen and Gladstone ensued; in which both parties clearly stated their own opinions, without either convincing the other. From this correspondence it certainly appears—whether from duplicity in any quarter, or from mutual misunderstanding—that there was not a perfect identity of aim and principle in the different parties promoting the bishopric at Jerusalem, and that the “scheme” was “understood and explained in contrary senses in Germany and England respectively.”† Mr. Gladstone apprehended, from Abeken's construction of the nature of the mission, that the exclusive validity of episcopal ordination would be impaired, since it appeared to be understood, that persons ordained by the Bishop of Jerusalem for German congregations, would be in full communion both with the Anglican, and with the Evangelical, Church, and might officiate alternately in each. His friend explains, in his reply, that the episcopate of Jerusalem was to be considered as a diocese in the *English Church*—and that although Germans acknowledged the Anglican ordination as valid (more liberal and catholic, it seems, in this respect, than their English brethren), yet German clergymen, so ordained, could not exercise their functions in English congregations, either at Jerusalem or elsewhere; which of course they could have

\* *Geschichtliche Darlegung mit Urkunden.*

† See Mr. Gladstone's Letter, Sept. 19th, 1843. *Kirche der Zuk.* Appendix, p. 417.

claimed to do, "if the bishopric had been a *common* one," relating equally to the Church of England and to that of Prussia. Against Episcopacy, in the sense of Mr. Gladstone—though friendly to it, as an element in Church discipline, and as having a root in the earliest development of Christianity—the Chevalier Bunsen enters an earnest and eloquent protest. (Appendix, pp. 410, 11, 12.)

This correspondence, and the difference of opinion which it was known to have called forth, naturally excited considerable interest; and it was circulated in manuscript among English friends. It was afterwards translated into German; and a few copies dispersed through private circles on the Continent. Portions of it found their way into the public prints, and gave occasion to very erroneous and even contradictory representations of Bunsen's views. He determined, therefore, in self-defence, to publish the whole of it;—and it was his first design, to send it forth alone, without any commentary, and let it speak for itself: but, on second thoughts, he deemed it the better course, to seize this opportunity of giving his views to the world on the whole subject of the mutual relation of Church and State—both as deductions from a few broad, fundamental, and universally-admitted axioms, and also with an immediate reference to the actual wants of the time. Neither the occasion nor the limits of the work admitted a *thorough* investigation of the subject—"at least after the German fashion of treating practical questions, i. e. to leave off, where the positive and the practical begin, but on no account to omit commencing the inquiry, endless ages before the creation of the world" (p. 17); and he therefore begs the reader to judge his book, according to its extemporaneous character, and to accept it as a simple confession (*einfaches Bekenntniss*) of his ecclesiastical belief.

The work, however, is any thing but superficial in its execution, and is remarkable for a compression of matter not usual in German authors. It exhibits the condensed results of very extensive historical research—apprehended in their relation to the Present, by a rare union of practical observation and experience with a spirit of philosophical generalization. The large application of philosophy to history in the later German schools, has evolved a series of axiomatic propositions—presupposing a knowledge of

innumerable facts in the reader's mind—which in works of a general character, like the present, are sometimes taken for granted, and reasoned from without hesitation; and these assumptions, with the elliptical forms of the philosophical terminology, give an occasional obscurity to Bunsen's language, which renders his meaning not immediately accessible to the English mind. We are not sure, that we have always understood him; where we are in any doubt, we will subjoin the original: but we conceive, we shall be performing an acceptable service for our readers, if we attempt to lay before them, as briefly and clearly as possible, the contents of a work, which is evidently the product of an earnest and accomplished mind, and which—however impracticable or objectionable we may be compelled to regard its theory—still abounds with ingenious ideas and fruitful suggestions, and is animated by an enlightened and catholic spirit.

The late Dr. Arnold's reverential affection for the Chevalier Bunsen, and known sympathy with his views of ecclesiastical reform, must secure for the opinions of the latter, on every question respecting the relation of Church and State, a thoughtful and candid entertainment in the minds of all our readers.

With a view, no doubt, to disarm the prejudices of his High Church friends in this country, Bunsen disclaims all reference to English controversies, and professes to write exclusively for Germany—and specially for Prussia. But a question for Germany, on any matter affecting religion, must, at the present day, be a question for the whole civilized world. The great traditions of the Reformation, so reverentially cherished among the most advanced portions of the human race on both sides of the Atlantic, attract the general regard to every effort made by her for the renovation and expansion of the Christian Church. For ourselves—the memory of our own venerable confessors who once found a shelter in her hospitable bosom, and the early reciprocation of help and protection between England and Germany under the changing visitations of religious persecution—keep up a warm and brotherly affection towards her people, inherited from those eventful times,—and make us feel, that, in the cause of religious freedom and progress, the interests of the two nations can never

long be separate or wholly at variance. Even where these considerations are unfelt—the actual prominence of the position of Germany in the field of speculative religion—her vast learning embracing every record and monument of the past, her lofty philosophy straining its vision to discern, in the comprehension of the most diversified phenomena, the ultimate truths of the universe—and, on the other hand, the recent awakening of her religious life, and the spontaneous combination of myriads of her sons, at this moment, to break their spiritual fetters, and work out for themselves a pure worship and free communion of equal brotherhood—are facts of the deepest significance, which draw us irresistibly towards every earnest expression of the German mind on the high themes of religion and the Church.

The fundamental principles of the author's theory are expounded in the introductory chapter. Under the "Constitution of the Church," taken in its widest sense, would properly be embraced both its liturgical form and its system of government and administration; and although the latter only is the immediate object of Bunsen's work, yet he has traced them both, as contra-distinguished from theology, to their common root in the fact of the *general priesthood of all Christian people*. This fact is the central point of Bunsen's theory.—In all religions, heathen and Jewish, there has been a priesthood, distinct from the people, to maintain through appointed *media* the intercourse between man and God; and these religions, in reference to the historical development of the divine plans, may be considered typical and anticipatory. The religious sentiment in man has two opposite poles—one, tending towards a sense of separation from God, under the consciousness of guilt,—the other, towards a feeling of dependence, in the experience of the divine benefits. *Sin-offerings* or atonements, and *thank-offerings*, were the corresponding expressions of these opposite tendencies; but neither sufficed to quiet the inward conflict of the soul. "Through long thousands of years," says Bunsen, "the whole religious life of the nations vibrated in a perpetual restlessness between these two poles. In fact, the interior history of their religions is nothing but a record of the oscillations of the spiritual pendulum between atonement and thanks-

giving. New atonements were presented; new offerings of praise went up with the smoke of the sacrifice to heaven: but the true sacrifice was never completed."—P. 64. The effect of Christianity on the spiritual condition of mankind, we will also describe in Bunsen's own words, rendered as faithfully as we can, since they will serve to show the English reader, how orthodox doctrines are conceived and applied by the philosophical believers of Germany.

"This unhappy strife" (i. e. in the human conscience) "was terminated by Christ's free and loving surrender of his will to that of the Father—a fact of life and death, in which Christ and the whole Christian Church with him, recognise the self-renunciation of deity, and which science—in other words, reason awakened to consciousness—demands as an everlasting act of God. Through this act of eternal love, at once divine and human (*gottmenschliche That*), those men who believed in it, became the percipients of the new spirit—a new, divine, inward power. The interior consciousness of the eternal, redeeming love of God (which is Faith) imparted the capacity, in spite of sin, of feeling at one with God, since it gave the power of separating sin, as the *evil, hostile* element of his nature, from the real man (*dem wahren Ich*), and so of freeing the life from that, which is the root of all sin—selfishness. Free self-surrender, in the spirit of thankful love to God and the brethren, now became possible—a self-surrender for the sake of God, in the feeling of gratitude towards him, for his previous love of us. In the language of tradition—of historical development—this fact is thus expressed: the great atonement or *sin-offering* of humanity was consummated through Christ, by means of his personal sacrifice; the great *thank-offering* of humanity was rendered possible through Christ, by means of the spirit: we say, of humanity, not of the nations; for as the breaking up of humanity into many divisions, was a consequence of the conflict in the interior of man, so the appeasing of that conflict brought with it a restoration of the unity of humanity."—Pp. 66, 67.

Whatever was typical, therefore, now ceased in Christ. The atonement had been made once and for ever; while the expression of thanksgiving was destined to a progressive realization in the public worship and religious life of all-coming time, as a perpetual incorporation of the human with the divine. All further mediation was unnecessary. Man had entered on his full, individual, responsibility, and held direct communion with God, as a priest to him-



self. He stood on his own personal foundation ; no other man could be answerable for him ; no outward act atone for his inward want of faith and love. Faith and morality now became inseparable, and of equal value ; and believers constituted a general priesthood.

Put into simpler language, the doctrine of Bunsen seems to amount to this—that faith in Christ, as a manifestation of deity—in other words, deep, inward sympathy with his divine, self-sacrificing love—so purifies and spiritualizes the human soul, and unites it with God, as to make it independent of external mediation and atonement—to throw it on its own personal convictions and efforts—and by fitting it for direct intercourse with God, to invest it with an intrinsically religious or sacerdotal character.

This great moral idea of an universal priesthood requires, according to Bunsen, a Christian state and people for its complete realization. The Church of the Middle Ages perverted it, by substituting a sacerdotal corporation for the whole body of the faithful, and so harshly separating the Church from the State : and this false principle was fixed by the Council of Trent. Through the doctrine of Justification by Faith—which is the counterpart of that of the universal Priesthood, inasmuch as it draws after it the ideas of full personal responsibility and of perfect freedom of conscience—the Reformation rendered possible the realization of a Christian State. Its error was, that it laid too much stress on theological dogmas. Of course, some dogmas, or at least certain divine facts,—such as the creation of man in God's image, the redemption by Christ, and the effusion of the Spirit—(p. 76)—must be recognized and pre-supposed in every ecclesiastical association—as a bond of spiritual communion among numbers ; but the form of worship, and the nature of the constitution, are of first importance in the development of the national mind, and constitute the principal distinction from the Church of Rome. What is needed, is the reign of the Spirit ; yet this, so far from excluding Christ, requires a fuller acknowledgment of him. In fact, dogma and constitution act and re-act on each other ; but the latter has more influence in modifying the former, than *vice versa*, although theologians have usually taken the opposite view, to the great injury of the true conception of Christianity.

Of the early Reformers, Calvin alone attempted to work out the idea of a Christian Commonwealth; but he wanted the necessary materials, and the world was not yet ripe for such an undertaking. Luther, in leaving the question open, and defining nothing, showed a profounder sagacity, and a stronger faith in the progress of the future. Christianity and civil freedom are mutually indispensable. Both must conspire to the advancement of society. In past times, there has been a separate struggle for each; Protestant nations have fought for religious, and Catholic for civil, freedom:—but now, the nations of Romantic descent do not desire liberty without religion, nor the Germans religion without liberty. This is the actual condition of Europe—a critical moment in the progress of nations and the influence of Christianity. The time has arrived for Prussia, when a free, national, and thoroughly popular, Christian society is at length possible: and it is with a special reference to this great demand of his country and his age, that the author has offered this work to the public.

In proceeding to the application of these general views, Bunsen remarks, that the doctrine of an universal priesthood lies at the basis of the constitution of the Evangelical Churches, and that we may substitute, as an equivalent expression, less liable to misapprehension, less open to the suspicion of mysticism—that of the entire moral responsibility of each individual to God. “The Evangelical Church considers the religious and moral elements in man as united and inseparable in their deepest roots, and is therefore bound to furnish the moral exponent of every objective expression of the mutual relation between God and Man.”—P. 91. To this broad doctrine, the retention in the Christian society of a clerical order—the institution by Christ himself (so Bunsen argues) before the effusion of the holy spirit, of the priestly office, holding the keys of heaven, and with power to loose and bind—seems, at first sight, completely opposed: the Christian society is created, and upheld in existence, by the exercise of this office, and ceases with it. But, on nearer view, it appears, that general priesthood and special office are mutually related, and help to explain each other, like the two parts of a contra distinction (*eines Gegensatzes*). Bunsen here ap-

plies the doctrines of the German philosophy to unfold his meaning. Kant has shown, in his development of the laws of transcendental thinking, that all complete knowledge depends on the full recognition of opposites or *antinomies*, which are founded in the nature of thought, and furnish the law according to which ideas are realised. But there is another law of not less importance, also discovered by German philosophy, according to which all such opposites flow from a common idea, including the higher unity of the truth, which is split and divided between them. In this way, the distinctions of the understanding lose their unconditional character, and first disclose their proper relation and essential truth.\* The higher unity of the two members of the distinction between a general priesthood and the priestly office, must be sought in the appointed discipline of man's moral and spiritual progress, or, in theological phrase, the order and constitution of the kingdom of God. In this discipline and order, the priestly office is necessary, not as an end, but as a means—a means prescribed by God and consistent with reason. It is a condition in the existence of a Christian society, as that existence is itself a condition of the development of the kingdom of God. So that the idea of a general priesthood includes of necessity that of the priestly office.

A similar distinction, capable in like manner of resolution into a higher unity—is that of Catholicity and Nationality, or, otherwise conceived, that of Church and State. Christianity was imparted at first to individuals and families; and then, gradually spreading, pervaded the whole of society, till the State incorporated it with itself. Hegel has defined a State to be the highest visible expression of morality; and so conceived, the idea of the State is capable of realization, so far only as the Church is in operation within it. Now morality is an universal interest of man; and every National Church becomes Catholic, i.e. is linked with the general cause of humanity—

\* The allusion seems here to a doctrine of the Hegelian School. "Toute idée renferme trois éléments. Vous pouvez la considérer, ou en elle même, ou dans son opposition avec l'idée contraire qu'elle renferme, ou enfin dans l'union qui les réconcilie." "L'idée existe d'abord d'une manière simple et immédiate, puis elle se divise et s'oppose à elle même; enfin elle ramène ses deux membres à l'unité." "L'identité des contradictions—voilà le principe de la logique et de la philosophie d'Hegel."—*Emile Saisset, De la Philosophie Allemande. Revue des Deux Mondes. Février 15, 1846.—P. 629.*

in the same degree, that it is conscious of its participation in this universal interest, and strives to realize the idea which grows out of it. On the other hand, as mankind are broken up into nations and tongues, the means of putting this moral idea in practice, must be furnished by the particular opportunities and conditions of national existence. Two conditions require to be combined in a true Christian State—first, a reception of the facts of Christianity, as a divine tradition—secondly, freedom of conscience for all the societies embraced within it, and recognized by it, as the highest interpreters of those facts. The Church stands in the same relation to the State, in the external condition of Christianity—as the general priesthood to the clerical office, in its internal: the State and the clerical office are not ends, but means; and as the moral order of the world suggests that higher idea, in which the subordinate ones of priesthood and office unite, so of Church and State—of spiritual and secular authority—we find the ultimate unity in the general idea of a Christian Rule or Reign—as the highest visible expression of morality. So conceived, the Church acquires its true significance and value; and though opposing its pretensions, as a sacerdotal corporation, to superiority over the State—we do not desire *less*, but, in a true sense, *more* Church, as an indispensable means to the realization of this higher unity.\*—(Pp. 98—104.)

\* It is not till he has proceeded thus far in the book, that the English reader sees very clearly what is meant by the title of Bunsen's second chapter (*Die beiden Forderungen der Reformation und ihre Evangelischen Gegensätze*). "The two demands of the Reformation (i. e. General Priesthood and Catholicity) and their Evangelical Opposites (i. e. Special Office and Nationality)."—After all, is there any occasion for so elaborate a development of this distinction? In plain English, does it amount to more than this?—that, although Christianity addresses itself to the individual conscience of all who embrace it, and so puts them on a footing of spiritual equality, individuals may, from their very desire to cherish these spiritual privileges, combine to appoint and support certain other individuals from among themselves, to minister to them in religious matters, and invest them with a provisional and responsible authority; and that, although Christianity addresses itself to our collective humanity, its outward expression must unavoidably be affected by the peculiarities that adhere to national life. But if of national, why not also, of local, class, individual, life? The one concession seems to us to draw after it the other. Christianity is either prescribed in a definite type for the mass; or it must be left to the unfettered convictions of the individual. No intermediate course is rational and self-consistent. This view does not exclude the possibility and desirableness of voluntary approximation and union. But the essence of faith—the very genius of Christianity—lies in freedom and spontaneity.

The distinctions or oppositions, now described, run through the whole of history; but their mutual relation was first distinctly perceived in the struggles which began with the 16th century. These struggles broke up the Church into conflicting fragments, and led in the last result to indifference. This state of things is now passing away; a tendency is everywhere visible towards new ecclesiastical organization (*neuer Kirchlicher Bildungstrieb*): but in yielding to this tendency, we must guard against a relapse into the old sacerdotal system of the Middle Ages,—which was a condition of law preparatory to a state of spiritual liberty—and embrace under our new constitution *People* as well as *Clergy*—*Nationality* as well as *Catholicity*. Religious freedom presupposes and requires a co-ordinate civil freedom. Synods and Representative Chambers furnish two separate streams of a national life, whose vital unity of influence is best secured by their entire separation (*ihre vollständige Getrenntheit*).—P. 106. Bunsen lays great stress on the distinction between a *State Church*, which he deprecates, as an inheritance of the Roman empire and the Middle Ages—and a *National Church*, which he thinks both attainable and desirable. He thus expresses his own sense of the distinction:—

“The State Church is exclusive, and therefore persecuting and oppressive; the National Church, in nowise so. The former is scarcely ever practicable;” (only where, as in Sweden, and formerly in Geneva, Church and State are commensurate, and cover each other—p. 107;) “the latter, in all cases, where the great mass of the people is not so far gone in the divisions of sects, that no one ecclesiastical association more than another, can be taken as an expression of the national life. The formula of a National Church by no means renders it impossible, that under a political constitution which secures equal political rights for all recognized Christian Confessions, and civil toleration for all sects and religions, that do not offend against morality, and so threaten danger to the State,—there should still subsist, side by side, several larger ecclesiastical associations, in which the national consciousness finds a predominant expression.”—P. 108.

To each of these larger associations, he conceives, that the State should secure not only their full rights and privileges, but also the outward aids and appliances of usefulness (state support)—taking care, however, that the more

powerful Churches do not oppress the feebler, and that all, whether great or small, be urged and encouraged to subserve the general good of their country. He considers the voluntary system, established in the United States of America, merely an embryo condition of religious society—desired by many earnest and noble minds—(Vinet, for example, who advocates the absolute separation of Church and State)—as a means of freedom and salvation, in cases where, as in the Pays de Vaud at the present day, a democratic tyranny crushes and persecutes the national faith.\* But the adoption of this system in Germany, he thinks would be a retrocession rather than an advancement.

The relation of the Medieval period to the ages which preceded, and which followed, it—the author thus conceives.—In classical antiquity and in modern times—by a different method, it is true—we observe Religion and the State, though different elements in society, subsisting in mutual harmony, aiming at a common object, fused together, and, as it were, interpenetrating each other. Between them intervenes—as in a sort of parenthesis—the Medieval period, in which the two powers—the Civil and the Spiritual—were violently drawn asunder, as having distinct interests and conflicting tendencies. This may be explained by the fact, that the nations of Western Europe, and Germany in particular, received Christianity from a sacerdotal corporation beyond the limits of their own national existence. This sacerdotal corporation, represented by the bishop as its head, constituted the only ecclesiastical person invested with rights (*die eigentliche Rechtsperson*), to the entire exclusion of the laity. So that when we look back on the Medieval Church, from an Evangelical point of view, we may say, that the idea of ecclesiastical right, developed by the clergy, had obliterated that of Christian truth—obedience to the clergy had taken the place of faith in the Eternal Word—and the judgment of the clergy had superseded the exercise of personal responsibility.—A Church

\* It must be observed, however, that Vinet defended the same views, long before the recent outbreak of religious disturbances in the Pays de Vaud, in his "Mémoire en faveur de la Liberté des Cultes," which obtained the prize offered by the Society "De la Morale Chrétienne," in 1826. On this occasion, an interesting and eloquent "Rapport" on the competition for the prize, was delivered by M. Guizot.

formed on such principles, Bunsen designates "the Clerical Church" (*Geistlichkeits-Kirche*), i.e. opposed to the People's Church and the notion of an Universal Priesthood. When so great a contradiction to the spirit of the Gospel was discerned, and the sense of it expressed in action, the Reformation was effected. The abolition of a clerical Church, and the admission of the people to their ecclesiastical rights, constituted the fundamental principle of the Reformation. But the reduction of that principle to practice, required a suitable training and education in the people; and no one more clearly saw this than Luther. Hence he did not venture to anticipate a definite ecclesiastical constitution. It has taken three centuries to prepare the people for further change—centuries of varied trial, conflict, and effort, in which the old system has been completely broken in pieces, and the Canonists who derive from it all their notions of ecclesiastical law, have been driven to utter despair. All the ecclesiastical constitutions that have arisen, and acquired fixity, during this period, have been founded, either on a remnant of the old Medieval episcopacy, or on a principle of direct contradiction to it.\* Bunsen looks with almost equal disfavour on Anglican Episcopacy, on Presbyterianism, and on Independency. In none of them does he find an outline of the Church of the Future. General dissatisfaction with all the established forms of Protestantism, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian, led, in the course of the last century, to a twofold reaction: (1.) to the surrender of all Church power to the dictatorship of the State, either directly, as at Geneva, where it resulted very naturally from the supposed equivalence of Church and State, or through the medium of Consistories, as in Germany; (2.) to Independency and its connected doctrine of the Separation of Church and State, or, as it is now called, the Voluntary System.

Bunsen has a very strong feeling against Independency. He says, it loses equally the idea of Nationality and Catholicity. While it protests against the State, the Nation

\* This is the fact intended to be expressed in the title of Bunsen's third chapter (*Die Mittelalterliche und Evangelische Geistlichkeits-Kirche und ihre Evangelischen Reste und Vereinigungen*). "The Medieval and Evangelical or Protestant Church of the Clergy, and its Evangelical Relicks and Negations." Bunsen's titles are a kind of enigma, then first intelligible, when one has worked through the chapter, at the head of which they stand.



escapes from it. We give his own words:—Its adherents

... "wish for freedom, and fall into a mischievous servitude—the Clergy, under the fanaticism of a local Congregation or its majority, the Congregation, under the one-sided dogmatism of their Preacher, tempered by no historical development. There is in this respect a very remarkable similarity between the theory of Independency and the Monastic life of the Middle Ages. Like the latter, it does not find the pure expression of the Christian character in the civil relations assigned it by God, but shrinks from an encounter with the world, instead of courageously encountering it with faith, and penetrating it with love. Despairing of the renovation of National Churches, held in slavery by the State, or in the worse bonds of worldliness—Independency forgets time and hour, and looks even on the Present itself, that hard-won inheritance of many centuries, as absolutely having no existence. In this despair, it is for beginning everything afresh, as though there were no Christian State—led away herein by American orators, who, like many before them, make a virtue of necessity: and so people are brought to see in an embryo condition, the height of perfection, and in the point of commencement, natural enough for such a country (as America), the end and haven of all development. We may deplore this one-sidedness and delusion, and yet acknowledge the great worth of Independency, as one of the elements in the constitution of a Church, and bestow our admiration on the Christian earnestness and zeal of its Confessors and Teachers. John Owen preached the doctrine of Liberty of Conscience with even more power and fearlessness than his contemporary, bishop Taylor—not, as a later time, in unbelief, but in belief—not in a sense hostile to the Church, but for the sake of the Church."—Pp. 138-40.

Having prepared the way by these general considerations and a retrospect of the past, Bunsen proceeds to the more specific object of his work—a statement of the principles on which a complete Evangelical constitution of the Church may be restored. His attention, as we have already remarked, is confined immediately to Germany, and more particularly to Prussia; and he thinks that there are latent in the Church system of that country—only waiting to be developed—principles that may be wrought out into a complete realization of such a reform. He founds this belief on the fact, that the general priesthood of Christians is virtually recognized in the constitution of the Protestant Churches of Germany. Setting out, after his usual mode, from broad historical generalizations, he descends step by

step towards particulars. The links in his chain of reasoning are sometimes obscure; but the order of his ideas is pretty nearly as follows.

The Divine Word is proclaimed to all men—through reason and conscience, through the law and the Gospel. All who hearken to it, are thereby constituted priests, and stand in immediate connection with God—invested with full personal responsibility, and emancipated from the slavery of self. This is Redemption (*Das göttliche Wort der erlösenden Liebe*). Two consequences result from this proclamation of the Divine Word:—1st, the divine office of making the proclamation; 2ndly, the social or congregational rights of those who accept it; and correspondent to these, are the two essential functions of every Church—that of preaching with cure of souls, and that of administering the discipline or internal rule of a Congregation. Both these functions are simply means and instruments; both, nevertheless, are founded on a *jus divinum* (*ein göttliches Recht*); the first, *immediately*, through Christ's primary institution,—the second, *mediately*, through the divine right which is inherent in human Society, or the State.—It is in the development of the last of these views, that the peculiarity—involving no little obscurity—of the author's system consists. Its general accordance with that of our own Hooker, must strike every reader. To guard, however, against the possible admission of a sacerdotal principle, the author strongly insists on the fact, that the clerical office exists within the limits of the Congregation, and is simply a condition of its continuance—in no sense, external to it; and though the whole of Society, from first to last, is in his view a divine institution, he calls every social act, done with *immediate* reference to God, *ecclesiastical*, as contradistinguished from a life, *mediately*, i. e. through worldly engagements, devoted to God, which is properly *civil* (p. 147). Bunsen recognizes three offices in the Christian Society: (1) pastors; (2) rulers; (3) a class of helpers to the former two.

The supreme authority (*die oberste Rechtsperson*) in the Church, is the Congregation (*Gemeinde*), i. e. the general body of the faithful.\* Now, "the conscience of believ-

\* The 19th Article of the Church of England defines "the visible Church of Christ," "a Congregation of faithful men."

ing, socially-organised, humanity is the highest representation or manifestation (*Darstellung*) of the believing totality" (p. 149). We give our author's words as closely as we can. Of this totality we only get a sight in the history of the Kingdom of God ; only in Christianity, do we obtain a view of the comprehensiveness of man's destination : in the world of reality it is altogether incapable of being represented. This totality must not be confounded with what is sometimes called "the invisible Church," i. e. the assembly of all those who, under various outward forms, are inwardly united with Christ—a question wholly foreign to the present inquiry ; nor again with the fiction of the Canonists, who supposed an imaginary personage—their invisible Church—as the centre of supreme ecclesiastical authority. The theologians, the consistory, the sovereign, were successively assumed by the Canonists as the representatives of this invisible Church, without, however, supplying the place of the lost idea ; and when, in the last century, some one was bold enough to suggest the Congregation (*Gemeinde*), this was understood, either of the local Congregation, or of the State. No one ever dreamed of a Church co-extensive with the history of the world.

The totality of mankind, viewed in its moral aspects, as destined to realize progressively the idea of the Kingdom of God—constitutes the body in which the supreme authority must ultimately be found : we cannot look for it in General Councils,—nor in an universal Church, which pre-supposes an Universal State. Thus, particular Christian States, among nations that have attained their majority, exhibit the nearest actual approach to this supreme authority—including those powers within them, that are imparted to ecclesiastical governors. Both pastors and ecclesiastical governors derive their authority from the Congregation, understood in the large moral sense already explained ; for the Congregation, i. e. a believing Community, is pervaded by the Spirit of God, and there can be no sovereignty above this Spirit :—which means, when put into ordinary phraseology—that, in the moral order of the world, there can be no higher power than the general Conscience, allowed to act freely and independently. To attain this power, there must

be perfect liberty of conscience, and the individual must be left to his full personal responsibility. Now, the moral order of the world is expressed by the Church; and this can only co-exist with the historical constitution of humanity in the State. Some government, therefore, is pre-supposed by the very conditions of the case;—*right*, whether civil or ecclesiastical, pre-supposes government. All actual governments are but approximations to the end desired; provisional restraints, acquiesced in, for the sake of the greater inconveniences which they exclude, and the hope of a better state to which we trust they may conduct us. But along with this prudential acquiescence, there endures in the human heart, deep and inextinguishable—like the dream of childhood amidst the storms of life—a presentiment of the one free and happy humanity which we are some day destined to realize. Various are the expressions of feeling which this presentiment has at different times called forth. Plato's republic, the French Revolution, and modern Socialism, are so many wild efforts to realize this ideal. In Protestant countries, the timely changes of the Reformation have obviated the most dangerous effects of an intense re-action against actual oppression and abuse. The old clergy, having failed to discharge their duties, and transferred their allegiance to a foreign power, the State stepped in, and became for a time the immediate governor of the Church, to the great satisfaction of its Christian subjects, who dreaded the return of priestly domination. The intellectual pre-eminence of Prussia, with its elevation to the rank of an European power, has been the first in the train of causes to prepare a termination to this state of spiritual bondage—this subjection of the Church to the State. We presume the author here alludes to the known respect of Frederic II.—the great hero of the Prussian civilization,—for the rights of conscience and free inquiry, and his full concession of their exercise to Schools and Universities. He adds, that it matters little whether freedom of conscience have been gained by men in a black or in a blue coat: the fact is, that in Protestant Germany, and especially in Prussia, the exertions of the laity in the fields of literature and philosophy, during the last seventy years, have recovered to the Church the entire domain of humanity.

The following is his tribute to the services of philosophy during that period :—

“Kant's doctrine of the freedom of the moral sense, founded on the independence of the moral law, as that which governs the divine ordering of the world, did more for the renovation of the Christian life, than all the dry dogmatists who watched over Zion in his day. Fichte's Idealism impelled himself and thousands with him, to a longing after that everlasting life in God, which Christianity holds out, while those watchers over Zion could discern in their religion,—here below, only a dry formulary of belief, and after death, nothing but a comfortable eternity of monotonous existence. Schelling's great radical conception of the Infinite and Absolute—as the Spirit—the primal source and foundation of everything finite and conditional, and of that divine unity which harmonizes all the oppositions of life—has conferred on the Idea, that independence of the outward and historical, which Christianity pre-supposes and requires, and which it actually cherishes in the heart and inward experience of every believer.”—P. 162.

Bunsen's sympathies are by no means, however, limited to philosophy. Here is a passage of another character, conceived in a beautiful spirit, and which does credit to his heart :—

“All Good and Truth are in the highest sense identical. He who does not believe, that all things true and good are Christian, has no proper faith in Christianity: and whoever is afraid of them, is, if not unbelieving, yet of very little faith. All true life has its root in Christianity, often, it is true, without being aware of it. We have been living, for generations and centuries, more than we are aware, in a Christian atmosphere; Christianity has penetrated more deeply than we suspect, into our language and social condition. Many cannot see the forest for the very multitude of trees, nor the sun for the strength of its reflection; but do not, on that account, whether willingly or not, the less render homage to the beauty of the forest and the light of the sun. In this view, every display of moral earnestness in Society is comforting to the Church, and full of significance for the future: and we may reckon among these encouraging signs more particularly, the fact, that, at this time, the movements of a new life are as conspicuous in the laity as in the clergy, and through all ranks; and finally, that among the clergy themselves, the most powerful demonstrations of zeal and energy have decidedly a social, popular, and brotherly character.”—P. 164.

To sum up our author's views, on this part of his subject—if we rightly apprehend them, they are these: that the

administration of Society—considered in its civil and its spiritual elements (which are only different manifestations of a common life) as a divine whole—is confided by Providence with supreme authority to wisdom and virtue; that wisdom and virtue, either through regular development or by the occasional re-actions of revolution, do in the main assert an actual ascendancy, and express the great progressive idea of humanity from age to age; that the State, in its largest sense, embracing within it the collective interests of Society, is, for the time being, the most adequate representative of that supreme authority, and exercises and directs all the powers which it confers, whether spiritual or secular;—with the implied understanding, that the State is faithful to its trust, and recognizes the principle of progressive social development.

A brief description of the mode in which Bunsen proposes to apply these principles to the ecclesiastical condition of Prussia, will suffice for the English reader. He begins with the local Congregations, and is friendly to their adoption of a modified Presbyterianism. The introduction of this system into the Evangelical Churches, was appointed by a national ordinance in 1817; and it has been carried into effect in the Rhenish and Westphalian provinces since 1835. Prussia, therefore, has witnessed the commencement of ecclesiastical reform—commencing at the proper point, the internal organization of individual Congregations. Bunsen insists on the inherent right of the Congregations to elect their own pastors, and manage immediately their own spiritual affairs; but the exercise of it has to be associated in practice with the conflicting rights of patronage, founded on long historical usage. He suggests a method of accomplishing this, and even thinks a mixture and balance of the two principles of popular choice and of patronage, best secures the result of a healthful freedom (p. 180). The parochial schools are an adjunct to the ecclesiastical system of Prussia, and greatly strengthen its moral and spiritual influence. Bunsen is warm in defence of this characteristic institution of his country. We must extract what he says respecting it:—

“In Prussia, there are about seventeen thousand parochial schoolmasters attached to Protestant Congregations; almost all of

them men, who up to fifteen years, or thereabout, have been educated in a school of the higher learning (*gelehrten Schule*), and, for a period of from two to three years, have prepared themselves theoretically and practically for their important office in one of the twenty-four Protestant Seminaries for the training of schoolmasters. Much has been said of the self-sacrifices, privations, and trials of the poorer Monastic orders. We will not dispute their merits. But we fearlessly assert, that neither the Middle Ages, nor the present day, can in truth show greater and more useful self-sacrifices, even to enthusiasm, in this respect, than what the far greater number of these young men voluntarily take on themselves and endure. For the most part, without any property of their own, lengthening out their days on a miserable pittance—in an age which offers so many more attractions and prospects than any previous one, to every man of tolerable education—they devote themselves cheerfully, without vows, and with no prospect before them but a life of toil, and a paltry salary, often not more than fifty dollars, nay, in some places less than the half or quarter of that sum, to an occupation which, without higher views and a spirit of love, is more deadening to the mind than any other. In their case, the well-known theory of a witty English Canon about ‘prizes in the lottery,’ is still less applicable than in that of our clergy. A noble thirst for knowledge in all,—affectionate interest in the training of the youth of their nation, and the self-sacrifice which faith inspires, in many,—can alone account, in thousands and ten thousands of instances, for such a resolution, and the perseverance with which it is carried out.”—“Persons who in England would be Dissenters and Dissenting preachers, find their sphere, under our National Church, in the rank of Schoolmasters. The entire institution of Seminaries for the education of Schoolmasters in Prussia, is, in our view, one of the most important in the whole monarchy, nay, one of the most significant phenomena of the age. As such, it has been acknowledged by many enlightened Frenchmen, distinguished as scholars and politicians, with whose judgment the statements very disadvantageously contrast, of some English travellers, who, in the most favourable case, know absolutely nothing of our language, literature, science, history, and popular life, but ordinarily just enough to misunderstand, and with proud self-sufficiency condemn, everything.”—Pp. 187-9.

Bunsen is in favour of an ampler development of this system of national education. Its foundations are laid; but he would elevate the position, and improve the circumstances, of its teachers, and bring it into closer connection with the Church.

One of the principal features in Bunsen's theory of ec-



clesiastical Reform, is the introduction of the episcopal element. He considers this as the main security for the independence of the Church,—a stable authority, interposed between the local congregations, and the higher tribunals more closely connected with the government—a barrier against democratic impulses on one side, and state encroachment on the other. The absence of such an authority necessarily involves the dictatorship of the State.—In the present ecclesiastical organization of Prussia—with the exception of the Rhenish provinces and Westphalia, where, as already remarked, the Presbyterian system has been introduced—the following scale and subordination of authorities exist:—above the Parish Churches or Local Congregations, 333 Circles with 386 Superintendents; then 25 Government Circuits, with an ecclesiastical Court in the chief town of the Circuit, for the induction of pastors, the administration of Church funds, and the exercise of a surveillance, like that of a police, over the separate parishes; next, the eight Provincial Consistories with the Upper President of the province at their head, for general inspection, and more particularly for the examination and proof of Candidates; lastly, in Berlin, the Directory of ecclesiastical affairs under a Minister of State. Bunsen would convert the Circles into Dioceses, and substitute a Bishop for a Superintendent. The change would be more than that of the mere name; for the bishop, as supposed to be constituted, would acquire the reality of a power, of which the Superintendent possesses but the shadow and the semblance. It is not essential that a bishop should be of the clerical order—many of the most distinguished bishops have been chosen direct from the laity.\* In the ancient Church, the ordination services of priest and bishop ran parallel,—i. e. one did not necessarily precede the other. On the whole, however, it would be more consistent with the feelings of the present day, that the bishop should not only be a clergyman, but should also retain the functions of preaching and the cure of souls,—and have his own particular Church and Parish. To the bishop, two lay Councillors should be attached, to form his Court, who must be chosen from the Synod of the diocese. Under this

\* Ambrose of Milan furnishes an instance.

limitation, Bunsen conceives that the appointment of these lay-councillors might be safely left to the bishop, subject to confirmation by the government; or that he should have the power of proposing them for the nomination of the government. With regard to the appointment of a bishop, Bunsen suggests, that out of three Superintendents or Pastors proposed by the provincial Synod, one should be chosen by the King. The visitation of the Churches in his diocese would be an important function of the bishop; but the office of Confirmation would still be left to the parish minister. The bishop must also have the power of refusing ordination; otherwise his conscience would be under constraint; he should be obliged, however, to give the Candidate a note of dismissal to another diocese, where the same objection to him may not exist. The case is different at the induction of a pastor (already ordained) into a new Congregation; here the bishop should simply have a right of protest, to be brought in due course before the next superior tribunal—that of the provincial Synod.

Above the diocesan Synods or assemblies of the Circle, should come the provincial Synods, embracing six districts or provinces in Prussia, determined by national, historical and political limits, each with an University belonging to it. The chief town of each of these provinces would form a metropolis, the bishop of which, though without a primacy, should preside, with the title of Metropolitan, in the provincial Synod, and have the casting vote. To the metropolitan bishop a court should be attached, to prepare matters for the Synod, and to examine and test appeals from the diocesan courts, and standing in the same relation to it—only with double the number of Councillors—as the bishop's court to the Synod of the diocese or circle. The Metropolitan should be chosen by the King out of a certain number of bishops presented to him. His Councillors too must be left to the immediate nomination of the King. The Metropolitan bishop should have the power of proposing three candidates to the King for his election in the case of all Crown livings, worth more than 800 dollars per annum; and the diocesan bishop should have the same power over Crown livings, amounting to that value or below it. The provincial Synod should decide, in the last resort, on the deposition of a parish minister, in case of an

appeal from the inferior Courts. As in the diocesan Synod, the order of schoolmasters should be represented, so in the provincial, the teachers of the Gymnasias, and the professors of the Protestant theological faculty in the University.

At the head of the entire system, there should be a Court of Ecclesiastical Review for the two cases, of divorce, and of the suspension or deposition of a bishop: the Minister presiding in it must be a layman, but an Evangelical Christian, with a Council of the same principles. The King would of course exercise a general political surveillance over the Church, and keep up, through the constituted organs, a perpetual intercourse with the Provincial Synods.—Bunsen thinks there would be no occasion for a National Assembly representing the whole Church, except at particular junctures, when it must be convened by the King, at the instance of the Provincial Synods, and the lay members of it have an unconditional veto. He lays it down as a broad, general principle, that the State, as such, has the right to exercise a general superintendence of police over the Church, and to nominate its higher administrative officials—the bishop and his lay councillors, the metropolitan with his—but in both cases from recognized members of the Church. He affirms, moreover, that neither the State should impose ecclesiastical decrees on the Church; nor an ecclesiastical assembly encroach on the rights of the Sovereign and people, by introducing any alterations but such as are within the competence of the Provincial Synod; and that the resolutions of that Synod, as well as of a General Assembly, must have the royal confirmation.

After this elaborate adjustment of the claims of Church and State, Bunsen concludes, that the Church would be the far greater gainer by adopting his system.—P. 278.

Bunsen has to meet the delicate question, whence the nomination and authority of his proposed bishops must proceed. He answers broadly, that every Christian community has full power within itself to constitute a new Clergy, independent of any external authority; that this principle was acknowledged by the Reformers—even by the lights of the Anglican Church, Jewell and Hooker—and, in later times, by Arnold, to whose love of truth and catholic spirit he pays, in passing, a just and eloquent tribute;—and that from her long and early conflicts and

efforts in the service of Christianity, the German Church is entitled to the general acknowledgment of Christendom, whether *with* or *without* bishops—that her historical character and position give her full power to create them for herself out of her own bosom, whenever she chooses. Undoubtedly—he adds—and his concession must be noticed—it would be the highest wisdom of the State in spiritual matters, to procure the recognition of the bishops of one National Church by those of other orthodox Churches, for the Episcopate offers the fittest and readiest medium of intercourse between National Churches; and on this account—provided the German Church maintain entire her fundamental principle, and have full security against sacerdotal pretensions—the presence of *historical* bishops from other Evangelical communities, to assist at the consecration of her first bishop, and solemnize her entrance into the Universal Catholic Church, would make the day of such an occurrence a day of note in the world's history (*der Tag würde ein Weltgeschichtlicher seyn*).—P. 317.

Bunsen disclaims all wish to put any constraint on conscience; yet, at the same time, expresses his desire, that what he calls “the great Evangelical National Conscience should become one.” He objects to the introduction of any new Confession into the United Evangelical Church of Prussia; and admits that Separatists—such as the Moravians and the Pietists—must for some time continue to exist. Past history, however, gives the assurance, that a free and spiritual Church would at length absorb them; and in the meantime they may be regarded as the *concealed orders* of the Church of the Future, marked out by their constitution and tendencies for the work of missions and an itinerant ministry—“the chrysalis”—as he expresses it—“of the Psyche which only awaits the gentle breath of Spring to unfold her wings.”—P. 319. In the Church of the Future, compulsory Confirmation, as a condition of civil employment, and the necessity of a religious service to give validity to the marriage tie, must be relinquished. On the other hand, the State is justified in requiring, that every child shall be baptized, in order that it may hereafter be recognised by the religious community in which it is born. The enforcement of discipline by penalties, on this and on other points, must be taken from clergy-

men, whose influence should be purely that of love and moral persuasion, and put into the hands of ecclesiastical Consistories, composed exclusively of laymen.

The relation of the Church to the state and progress of learning, or what the Germans peculiarly call Science (*Wissenschaft*), is another point in the Constitution of the Church of the Future, on which Bunsen explains himself. The Professors in the Theological Faculty are appointed by the State, with the implied understanding that they teach in accordance with the doctrines of the National Church; and if the compact be violated, the Church is entitled to complain, and the State must interfere. Otherwise, Theological teachers would enjoy absolute irresponsibility. Complaints against them for transgressing the established rule of faith, must be brought before the Provincial Synod, inasmuch as their offence is against the Church, and there they must be heard and judged; but the sentence can only be carried into effect by the Sovereign, after due observance of all the forms prescribed. Freedom of instruction (*Lehrfreiheit*) is often misunderstood. There is no limitation to it, through the Press, and in the Philosophical Faculty (i. e. on scientific subjects): there the freedom is complete.

In conclusion, the author remarks, that the day of a State Church, and equally that of Sects and Separatists, is over and gone. The end and aim of the constitutional tendency in all Christian nations, is one and the same—to bring State and Church into vital harmony, by assigning to each its proper sphere of action; but the point of departure and the process of development are greatly diversified. The precise character of the point of departure is of little moment, if only it be found in a living element of Society. God and history furnish it; and of all historical conditions, the most historical is the reality of the Present (*aller Geschichtlichkeiten geschichtlichste ist die Wirklichkeit der Gegenwart*).—P. 350. We must begin, wherever life manifests itself; and there is hope for the future Church, from the new religious life, the zeal for philanthropic and spiritual objects—for a practical Christianity—which is now springing up in Germany on all sides. Two great errors must be guarded against—the idolatry of the past, and the unqualified abnegation of it. All the Churches of

Europe are sitting amidst ruins; that of Germany alone comprehends the fact, since it is more imbued than the others, with the Spirit that makes everything new. Within the last seventy years—notwithstanding manifold errors and perplexities—German philosophy has laid a firmer and more immovable, because a more spiritual and living, foundation for a new form of Christian life—and this, not for Germany alone, but for the whole of humanity. In a renovation of the Christian life, far more than in the prosecution of science, must be sought the means of bringing on the Church of the Future. The religious organization of the Rhenish and Westphalian provinces, and of other parts of Germany—with the foundation of the Gustavus Adolphus Institution for the union of Protestants of all opinions, which is daily linking itself more and more with the various associations for the encouragement of practical Christianity—are encouraging indications of the new spirit which exists. Nor is there any fear of the formation of a Catholic League, to resist this Protestant movement. On the contrary, the Catholic population of Germany is patriotic, and desires emancipation from a foreign yoke; and the working of this impulse is conspicuous in the efforts and tendencies of the New German Catholic Church. Protestants of various shades of opinion, whether attached to Lutheranism, to Episcopacy, to Presbyterianism, or to the system of the Free Church of Scotland, all partake in these generous and comprehensive wishes for the future; and the sympathies of the King are with them:—but nowhere are Independency and the Voluntary Principle less in favour, or the objections to them more thoroughly understood, than in Germany.

We have largely trespassed on the patience of our readers, by this extended analysis of Bunsen's work; but it would not have been possible, on a more cursory survey, to give an adequate idea of its principles and their applications. Constitution and liturgy, according to him, far more than theological dogmas, constitute the essence of a Church. Of the first, he has given us his views, in the book which we have just examined; he has expressed his conception of the second, in his Universal Hymn and Prayer Book. The two works together make up the sum total of his ecclesiastical Confession.



The most striking nature in the last work, is its minutely-systematic, and in one sense High Church, character. It is designed, as the title imports, for the offices of domestic, as well as of public, devotion. It commences with a very good selection from the Psalms, for the morning and evening service of every day of the month, with directions for chanting them, and references to such as are suitable to particular occasions and Church festivals. Then are given the three songs of praise from the New Testament, with the "Gloria in excelsis" of the Eastern, and the "Te Deum" of the Western, Church. After this come the Hymns (*Lieder*), which are arranged, with a two-fold reference to the order of the Divine dispensations, and the divisions of the ecclesiastical year, under three great general heads:—(1.) The time of Preparation; (2.) The time of Christ; (3.) The time of the Church.—The devotional poetry of Protestant Germany is exceedingly rich. From the Reformation downwards, the religious spirit of the people has constantly uttered itself in song. Bunsen has drawn largely and judiciously on this ample treasury. The names of Luther, Paul Gerhard, the Bohemian Brethren, Tersteegen, Spener, Count Zinzendorf, and Gellert, adorn his list of contributors. His leaning has evidently been towards the authors of the older song. Most of the Hymns are from the earlier part of the eighteenth, from the seventeenth, and even from the sixteenth, century; few, if any, from the present day. Nor can it be denied, that in many of these ancient out-pourings of the Christian heart, there is a solemn pathos and fresh simplicity—an impress of reality and conviction, free from all prettiness and sentimentality, in the thought, the diction and the verse—which is inexpressibly touching and delightful. But to our taste their very truthfulness sometimes unfits them for present use. The theological belief of their day stands out in them with an undisguised, honest, nakedness, which must repel the cordial response of many modern minds—at least without such reservations and qualifications, as wholly destroy the directness and force of a pure devotional feeling. With a deep sense of the rich and rare beauty, which pervades a great part of Bunsen's Collection—we must still say, it savours too much for us of an ecclesiastical spirit—of reference to a



system assumed and prescribed, and does not sufficiently recognize the spontaneous wants and aspirations of universal humanity, and the free movements of our natural affections, hallowed and elevated by the pure and loving Spirit of Christ.

In the Prayer Book, or second part of the Universal Liturgy, we have a connected arrangement of lessons from Scripture for every day—exhibiting a complete history, with their mutual relations, of the old and new dispensations, according to the divisions of the ecclesiastical year. In the order of Morning and Evening Prayer, as well as in the Services for Sunday, the materials are drawn from various sources—from Luther, from Catholic formularies, and from the Latin of the old Ritual. The Gospel and Epistle with suitable Collects are assigned for every Sunday in the year. A form of Confession and Absolution is given in the offices for Sunday—and provision is made for the public recitation of the Apostles' Creed, and, when it is wished, of the Nicene Creed. For Ascension-day, the Evangelical narratives of our Lord's proceedings from the Resurrection to the Ascension, are arranged and put together in an Appendix; and in another Appendix, we have a history of the destruction of Jerusalem from Josephus. The various offices of the Church—Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony, Communion of the Sick, &c. &c.—are all, as in our own Prayer Book, furnished with suitable forms. The volume, which is a very thick one, concludes with forms of private devotion for various occasions, extracted from different authors.

The Chevalier Bunsen gives many proofs of the earnestness of his zeal for the renovation of a religious spirit among his countrymen. We observe, that he announces a new work in several volumes, "On the Idea of the Restoration of Christian Worship" (*Die Idee der Herstellung der Christlichen Anbetung*), of which the first part is to come out in the present year. The appearance of a layman of his social position in this field—and in Germany—is a significant phenomenon.

We have left ourselves but little space;—yet we cannot lay down the pen, without a few very brief remarks. The general impression left on the mind, at the conclusion of Bunsen's work on the Church of the Future—is one of

some disappointment at the practical result of his elaborate theory—a feeling, that the application of his principles does not fulfil the great expectations which the primary enunciation of them excited. When he descends from speculation to facts, the characteristic timidity of the German mind seems to take possession of him. He bows before authority; he stands paralyzed in the presence of the actual and established; and the comprehensive formulas—the vast generalizations—with which he opens his inquiry, shrink, as he proceeds, with disappointing collapse, into the dimensions of very ordinary realities. His great doctrine of the general priesthood of Christians is so qualified and restrained on all sides, in its reduction to practice, that it becomes at last a very feeble security for individual freedom of conscience. Though he seems to regard his own theory as a very bold one, and as conceding such large powers to the Church of the People, that only a reliance on the safe and steady working of a measure, in itself required and equitable, could justify a wise prince in adopting it (p. 278);—yet, when we have struck the balance between the various allotments of power, with their checks and counter-checks, which it proposes to establish—and reflect, that the virtual nomination of the higher officers of the Church—the Bishop, and the Metropolitan, their respective Councillors, and the members of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Court—with the distribution of a large amount of patronage, a direct *surveillance* of police, and the enforcement by pains and penalties of Church discipline—are all surrendered to the civil government—it is impossible not to see, that an immense preponderance of power must remain, after all, in the hands of the King and his Ministers; and that without some ampler guarantee for civil freedom—some more efficient restraint on regal despotism—than is provided for in this theory, the religious liberties of the people must be wholly at the mercy of the Sovereign for the time being: or that, if we suppose the popular feeling, encouraged by the system, sufficiently strong, to venture in any case on open resistance, the necessary consequence must be, such a collision between the civil and religious elements of Society, as it is the professed object of this theory to prevent.

Throughout the work there is too great a love of system

—of legislation for the minutest particulars. The author seems afraid of the escape of any strong individual life. Everything must be brought within the limits of the Church and the Government. Even the free movements of philanthropy and religious zeal—though hailed as the signs of a reviving life—are still looked upon as the subject of future law and arrangement—elements, that are to come under the control, and must be wrought into the general discipline, of the Church.

It occurs to us, moreover, as an objection to Bunsen's theory of the Future Church, that there is no distinct provision in it for progressive expansion. The liturgy is definitely fixed, anticipating with its prescribed forms all possible occasions and emergencies, and embracing in its widespread system of rules, not only the offices of public worship, but with almost equal precision the offerings of household devotion: and although the creed retained for ordinary recitation, is the simplest of the three transmitted from antiquity, yet it is still, in a great measure, rather the declaration of certain outward facts, conceived in the hard, concrete, form of the primitive age, than a simple expression of the Christian spirit; and the Prayer Book throughout, as well as the Collection of Hymns by which it is preceded, are impressed with strong, decided lineaments of the received orthodox theology.—Our profound conviction is, that the unvarying use of such a formula, day after day and year after year, though it might produce an ecclesiastical, would not cherish a devotional and Christian, spirit, but must issue in a general result of formalism and deadness.—We are not insensible to some advantages attending the partial use of fixed forms in public worship; they bestow a venerable character of stability and permanence on those parts of the Service, which draw all human beings to their common Father under the unchanging relations of dependence, humiliation, gratitude and trust: but we are equally convinced, that, to preserve their value and influence, such forms must be subjected to occasional revision, and must always be associated with a large and even predominant concession of free utterance to the leader of the public devotions.

The Chevalier Bunsen anticipates the final reunion of the few Separatists that exist in Germany, with his

future Church; but it is clearly implied, that this must be the effect of their acquiescent adoption of the established system. How far this would be a benefit to them, must entirely depend on the superior amount of vital truth which that system contains. We profess ourselves to be ardent lovers of peace and unity, and we trust, the day will come, when the beautiful idea of an universal Christian brotherhood may be realized. But we cannot see the reasonableness and justice—in the present state of knowledge and opinion—of any one Church, however learned and enlightened its teachers and rulers, however comprehensive and philosophical its conceptions of theological dogmas—taking upon itself to become an authoritative exponent of Christian truth, and expecting others to accept its decrees. Spiritual truth is not always with the scholar and the philosopher; it wells up from the fresh fountains of the pure and unperverted heart: of old, it was hidden from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes. The only just course, that seems possible to us, in the present state of affairs, is for each religious community to lay aside all airs of superiority, to hold itself open to fresh light and higher influences, to recognize the equal claims of other communities, and, in the spirit of Christian faith and love, to join with them in searching out that common truth which lies in the midst of them all.

We do not mean to assert that the Chevalier Bunsen repudiates the idea of progression in religion, though his constitution of the Church of the Future seems to exclude it. In the close connection and reciprocal influence which he everywhere acknowledges between theology and philosophy, and in the unlimited freedom of expression which he assumes for the latter, both through the press, and in the particular Faculty assigned to it in the Universities—he no doubt looks to providing indirectly for this want, which he has apparently passed over in his theory of the Church. But here we find, if we do not misunderstand him, one of the most objectionable features in his system—a want of perfectly simple dealing and good faith, in the relation of the learned and philosophical to the people. The formulas of the old orthodoxy are to be preserved in the public worship, while the initiated are taught to understand them in a sense, which reduces them to powerless

abstractions, and deprives them of all meaning and reality. No doubt, it is taken for granted, that light will be constantly brought down from the higher regions of philosophy by the clergy who are stationed among the people, and that new interpretations, demanded by the advancing state of science, will be successively affixed, in the course of their instructions, to the old traditional forms which the mass must still be accustomed to revere. Progress, it is true, is here recognized as a necessity, but not with that trustful faith in man, which makes it a blessing. We are unavoidably reminded of the notable expedient of a well-known English philosopher and divine, for reconciling Science and the Bible—taking the last view which the former renders necessary, as the orthodox interpretation of the latter, and then bending text and context to it, as best we may. There is too much of the old distinction between *esoteric* and *exoteric* in all this, to satisfy our sense of human rights. We are persuaded, moreover, that even as a matter of policy, this plan would never succeed. The people, as light gathered round them—and gather, thank Heaven, it must in this age—would soon begin to suspect, amidst the ingenious explanations offered them, that something more was still behind, which their instructor did not think it proper to reveal; loss of confidence in him would be the certain result; his words would no more seem the words of simplicity and truth; suspicion would exaggerate the difference between the revealed and the hidden; and distrust, vague scepticism, and alienation from religion, even under a servile adhesion to its prescribed observances, would enervate and deaden the spiritual life of the community.

Why not be open and ingenuous with the popular heart? Why not speak to it the plain and simple truth on questions, in which all human beings have the same deep interest? Why not come forth from the retired shades of science and philosophy into the broad day-light of our common humanity, and in all honesty, with cordial outstretched hand, invite the general brotherhood to contemplate seriously those great, undeniable, eternal facts of history without us, and of consciousness within, in which the duties and destination of our race are imperishably revealed? And why not, with a generous faith in man, and

in that God who works evermore with immediate energy in the impulses and aspirations of the religious spirit—permit each association of worshippers—without thereby dissolving their connection with the great Christian fraternity—to cast away the dead forms of a by-gone belief, which have no longer any significance for them, and take in their place those living realities of the word of Christ, directly embraced and freely interpreted by each believing heart—which, as they have hitherto survived all the vicissitudes of theological systems, so must they carry with them to the end of time, the unassailable credentials and inward strength of pure Christianity?

It is the want of this cordial recognition of popular conviction and feeling, and the absence of an immediate vent for its free and natural expression—far more than his introduction of the episcopal element, or his opposition to the voluntary system as hitherto conceived—which alienates us from Bunsen's theory of the Church of the Future, and in our judgment constitutes its vital weakness. From the simple fact, that it seems to us a more frank and earnest expression of the popular heart, we cannot deny, that we have readier sympathy with the general movement and tendencies of the New German Catholic Church; and if it escape the dangers with which, it must be confessed, it is menaced, of popular excitement and delusion on one hand, and of the excess and violence which may accompany the re-action against attempted suppression, on the other—if it shall calmly and wisely fulfil the mission traced out for it by the enlightened Gervinus\*—we anticipate from it more lasting and more beneficial effects on the future religious condition of Germany, than from the refined and nicely-calculated arrangements of the scholastic mind of Bunsen. In the New German Catholic Church there are already in full action the various elements of a deep popular religious life; it has its basis in reality: Bunsen's seems to us a premature attempt to build up, on the basis of a traditional Protestantism, out of materials furnished rather by history and philosophy, than by strong popular convictions, a complete and ultimate form of national religion, and rather to express the

\* See "Die Mission der Deutsch-Katholiken." Heidelberg, 1845.

conceptions of the learned, than to meet the wants of the public. The present intense re-action in Germany and France against Ultra-montanism and the influence of the Jesuits, is in our view one of the most significant among the religious phenomena of the day. It will not rest, we may be assured, in simple re-action. Writers of such boldness and eloquence as Michelet and Quinet, will carry it far beyond that. It must take up the previous question of the source of all religious authority, and go back to first principles. Among the subjects of its earnest, searching investigation, will be included the Reformation itself, as well as the Council of Trent; and in its final results, it must involve great changes in the constitution and doctrine not only of Catholic, but of all Protestant, Churches.



ART. VII.—*The Examinations and Writings of John Philpot, B.C.L., Archdeacon of Winchester.* Martyr, 1555.  
 Edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. Robert Eden,  
 F.S.A. Cambridge University Press. 1842.

WE have pleasure in selecting, from a mass of unreadable matter with which the rival High Church and Low Church Societies are inundating the press, one work which is deeply interesting and instructive. Its value lies in the genuine picture it exhibits of the manners of the sad æra in which the occurrences took place, and a revelation of genuine human feelings. Its hero appears equally as a warning and an example, and the book teaches a great deal more, we believe, than its present publishers intend.

John Philpot, though one of the less eminent of the Marian Martyrs, was both a man of good family and a scholar. He was born in 1511; was educated at Oxford; obtained a fellowship in New College; and travelled in Italy during the heat of the commotions occasioned by the falling off from Rome of Henry VIII. Philpot was, on his return, advanced to the Archdeaconry of Winchester in the reign of Edward VI. On the accession of Queen Mary, a convocation was held for the purpose of re-establishing the old church, the proceedings of which belong to the history of the times. A curious report is given in this volume of those parts of the discussion in which the Archdeacon was involved. Freedom of speech had been proclaimed by authority, and he availed himself of his liberty manfully. The point on which he dwelt, and for which he died, was the real presence, which he denied, in any other sense than that in which it is now maintained in the Anglican Church. For this he was thrown into prison after the convocation was dissolved. He was removed from the jurisdiction of his own ordinary, and transferred to the Coal-hole, a name given to the prison attached to the Palace of Bonner, Bishop of London. He was brought before the Bishop, and the most valuable portion of the volume consists of a seemingly verbal report of his Examinations. It is not possible to refuse our admiration to

the courage and ability with which Philpot argued all the points of form, technical legal objections to the proceedings against him,—he pleading the want of jurisdiction, as well as the privilege which he claimed for the convocation as appertaining to parliament. But at the same time he evinced no desire to save himself. Bonner alternately flattered and threatened, and would have been well pleased had Philpot availed himself of any means of escape. Having admitted on one occasion that he believed in a real presence, one of the more humane judges interposed. He had said enough, and they were satisfied. He wished that Philpot should escape through the ambiguity of a word, but the Martyr would not be taken in, and insisted on adding an explanation (that now given by the Anglican Church), which it was death to maintain. We pass over this sacramental question for another, which at this hour is as warmly contested as ever, and on which every other question depends; in answering which it will be found that logically the Examiners had the best of the argument. We mean the great question of authority which lies at the root of that most significant diversity of opinion, which has not yet broken out into open schism, but which separates in spirit the members of the Church into two great classes,—those who receive the Scriptures on the authority of the Church, and those who acknowledge the Church on the authority of the Scriptures:—

“I pray you,” says the Bishop of *Gloucester*, “by whom will you be judged in matters of controversy?”

*Philpot*.—“By the word of God.”

*Gloucester*.—“What, if you take the word one way and I another way? Who shall judge then?”

*Philpot*.—“The primitive Church.”

*Gloucester*.—“What if you take the doctors in one sense and I in another? Who shall be judge then?”

*Philpot*.—“Then let that be taken which is most agreeable to God’s word.”

Here the argument stopped; but it is certain that Philpot evaded the question. It would have been conceded to him that the judge ought to decide according to God’s word, but the question was, in whom was the power of decision. This shuffle, for it is no better, has been retained

in the Anglican Church, and is exhibited in her twentieth article. It gives the Church expressly authority in controversies of faith, and then makes a sham concession that the Church *ought* to decide in conformity with Scripture. But who shall say whether the Church has or not done as she ought? Why, herself accordingly to the article. We do not therefore mean to impute it as a grave offence, against a man arguing with the assurance that the immediate consequence would be a painful death, that he should have betrayed a confusion of mind which has been retained in the victorious church that sprung out of his ashes.

A more flagrant evasion had been practised by Philpot at the Convocation, also to be excused by the peril of his position, as well as by the confusion of ideas on the subject; and on a point in which the Romanists, as opposed to the ordinary Bible-Christians, will be found in the right, and more in conformity with a rational explanation both of Church and Scripture. Philpot's evasion is almost ludicrous, the question being,—‘Which existed first, the Church or the Scripture.’ Philpot answered, “The Scripture.” And it being then objected that there was no Scripture till many years after Christ's death, Philpot replied that “in very deed all prophecy uttered by the spirit of God was accounted to be Scripture before it was written by men in paper and ink: . . . . as the salutation of the angel was the Scripture of Christ and the word of God before it was written”—an argument, which, in fact, renders tradition itself a form of Scripture, or converts it into Scripture whenever recorded by the Church.

We meet also with another point on which these Romanist Examiners pursue the very course now taken by the Pro-Romanist Puseyites against the common enemy, their Biblical or Evangelical opponents. Then, as now, the assertion by the Catholics was, that the great Orthodox doctrines are not to be found in the Scriptures. The argument of Philpot in answer, supplies a measure of the polemical skill as well as the Biblical learning of the Reformer:—

*Christopherus*.—“How do we know that Christ is *homoousios*, that is of one substance with the Father, but by the determination of the Church? Now, can you prove that otherwise, by express

words of Scripture? and where find you *homousios* in all the Scriptures?"

*Philpot*.—"Yes, that I do in the first of the Hebrews, where it is written that Christ is the express image of God's own substance, *eiusdem substantiæ*."

*Christopherus*.—"Nay, that is not so: that is, there is no more but *expressa imago substantiæ*, the express image of God's substance; and image is accident."

*Philpot*.—"It is in the text of his substance, *substantiæ illius*, or of his own substance as it might be right well interpreted. . . . And whereas you say *image* here is accident, the ancients use this for a strong argument to prove Christ to be God because he is the very image of God."

*Christopherus*.—"Yea do? Is this a good argument, because we are the image of God, *ergo* we are God?"

*Philpot*.—"We are not called the *express* image of God as it is written of Christ; and we are but the image of God by participation, and, as it is written in Genesis, we are made to the likeness and similitude of God. But you ought to know, Master Christopherus, that there is no accident in God, and therefore Christ cannot be the image of God, but he must be of the same substance with God."

*Christopherus*.—"Tush."

The Tush of the sixteenth we presume to be equivalent with the Psha! of the nineteenth century. We really think it not inapplicable. Such wretched reasoning and such palpable evasions as we have exhibited must excite contempt, and contempt is the parent of cruelty.

A still better apology for a murdering persecution, as we are warranted in believing this to have been, is found in the express justification of it by Philpot himself in these very examinations:—

"As for Joan of Kent, she was a vain woman. I knew her well—and a heretic indeed, well worthy to be burnt, because she stood against one of the manifest articles of our faith."

Now, the articles denied by Philpot were equally manifest to those who had the legal authority to punish. For, according to their doctrine, it was the Church whose declaration ascertained the doctrines, of which the Scriptures were but an imperfect historical evidence.

In order to do but ordinary justice to these persecutors, some of whom at least we believe to have been as con-

scientious as the sufferers, we should never forget this right or duty to punish heresy by death, proclaimed by the Martyrs. We must also bear in mind the absolute necessity of recognising a judge, if penal law in matters of faith be established: also, that those who condemned Philpot held their office by a prescription which had undergone only a short interruption—an interruption effected by means of which all candid Protestants must be heartily ashamed. We do not doubt that these judges, with the feelings generated by the exercise of authority, honestly deemed the heresies of Philpot, in denying what they deemed a manifest article of faith, not the involuntary mistake of a confused understanding, but the perverse and wicked will of a mind depraved by conceit and malignity, which it is the duty of the state to repress under the direction of the Church. On our own principles we retain the abhorrence we have ever felt for the persecutor, but this volume rather weakens than enhances that feeling towards the Roman Catholic persecutors of the first English Reformers.

The rest of the volume consists of tracts and letters. We take little or no interest in the theology of Philpot; and the letters have no historic value comparable to the Examinations; but there is one very curious tract, showing how the Martyr and the Persecutor may be combined in one person, which the editor is constrained to declare "the least gratifying of Philpot's productions." This is the "Apology for spitting upon an Arian." He even expresses a hearty desire "that Philpot's zeal had wanted this manifestation;" but he rather ludicrously concludes, that, "if the language is strong, it must be excused as the outburst of a righteous displeasure; not against the persons, but the tenets of those whom he reproves." Why! Were the tenets spit upon, or the person? In the full title it is said to be "an Invective against the Arians, the very natural Children of Anti-Christ." We shall be excused stating the argument of an invective; but as that invective is rich of its kind, and is a specimen of—what shall we say—religious, or Church Billingsgate—we copy the concluding sentence:—

"Let the ground, O Lord, open, and let them go down alive

into Hell! let them be put out of the book of life, and let them not be reckoned among the righteous: let them have the traitor Judas's reward: let them break asunder in the midst, and let their bowels gush out to their shame for ever: let their bowels issue out behind, as Arius's bowels did, and let them die in their own dung with their father: . . . let their stinking smoke be done out never: let the just rejoice when they shall see the revengeance of the glory of Christ."

To the word bowels, the editor adds a note, that it is a substitution for that used by the author. This is an amusing illustration of that spurious delicacy which gross minds affect. Mr. Eden thought no harm in spreading an atrocious sentiment, not unlikely to excite sympathy and prove infectious, but his squeamishness will not allow him to copy the harmless but inelegant word *guts*.

The rest of the tract is in the same style; and the invective is not justified by any critical or argumentative accompaniment, so that the re-printing such a composition can serve only to nourish and gratify the *odium theologicum*. Should the publication be thought harmless, on the ground that it will excite no sympathy from any portion of the religious world, we avow our opinion that this involves dangerous misappreciation of the character of the age. Our opinion is, on the contrary, that there is no one of the extravagancies or follies of past ages into which we might not be driven by a slight change of circumstances. In this *enlightened* age (that is the stereotyped epithet) the Roman Catholics have ostentatiously announced miracles surpassed by none in extravagance and grossness among those of the middle ages. And in that model republic which boasts to have improved on the liberal institutions of Europe, the United States of America, we see combined a set of fanatical impostors, if possible exceeding in folly any that Europe has seen, the Mormonites, who have also their miracles. And, at the same time, every sect of professing Christians (to which the Unitarians are not altogether an exception) have concurred in representing slavery as authorised by Christianity, whilst the democratic party now in possession of the government loudly proclaim the determination to spread slavery, as a national institution, over the vast countries they systematically incorporate with their body; while the more daring of their

demagogues anticipate the extension of this government and its slavery over the whole hemisphere! And in our own country, to say nothing of our recent fanatics, we have had, from the loudest declaimers in favour of the voluntary system, a practical denial of the right of free inquiry by the Calvinistic and Methodistic Dissenters in their unsuccessful resistance to the Dissenting Chapels' Act. With a recollection of all these deplorable inconsistencies, we cannot think ourselves safe against a revival of religious persecution. It is not to be forgotten that intolerance was for many ages both the doctrine and the practice of all Christian bodies, having power. We do not, therefore, think it safe to send abroad vehement and passionate declamations in favour of persecution, like those of Philpot in this tract. Such declamations can always be clothed in scripture language, which will be more successful than scripture argument. What a repository of phrases in favour of persecution is the Old Testament! They are few in the New Testament. It is only in Rome, perhaps, that sermons are on stated days preached from the words of the parable, "*Compel them to come in.*" But it still must be acknowledged to be one of the hardest triumphs of a pure and rational religion,—the uniting to zeal for the promotion of personal religion a perfect freedom from intolerance, and an entire abstinence from all ill-will towards those who counteract the labours of the missionary or apostle. And we cannot but fear that vituperative eloquence, like that of Philpot, might easily excite corresponding feelings among a large proportion of the *soi-disant* religious public, to whom the language of scorn and hared is as *sweet music*.



## POSTSCRIPT

*To the Article on Bunsen's Egypt, in No. V.*

SINCE our Article on Bunsen's Egypt was written, our attention has been called to a letter addressed by Dr. Edward Hincks to the Editor of the "Literary Gazette," dated December 2, 1845, in which he replies to some observations made by Mr. Birch, of the British Museum, on the challenge which he had given to the Chevalier Bunsen, to read the *Todtenbuch*. See our last Number (p. 8), note. We learn from it, with much pleasure, that Dr. E. Hincks is about to publish a paper, in which he expects to give the true alphabet of the ancient Egyptians for the first time, and to show that its analysis by Champollion, Salvolini and Lepsius is erroneous and imperfect. This is the only mode, we are convinced, in which the soundness of his system can be brought to the test; it will thus be submitted to the judgment of the Egyptologists, who are thinly scattered throughout Europe. Those who are acquainted with Dr. Hincks's valuable papers on these subjects in the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy and Dublin University Magazine, and the remarkable success with which he has exercised the difficult art of *decyphering*, will anticipate much instruction from this exposition of his views. The question of the interpretation of the hieroglyphics will indeed still remain; and, we are convinced, can never be satisfactorily solved but in the same way,—the publication of Dr. Hincks's own version of those texts which he thinks have been wrongly rendered by Champollion and his school.